Taber, Toni

From: Mossing, Mackenzie
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:16 PM
To: Agendadesk
Cc: Ho, Nathan
Subject: FW: Opposition to build Tiny Homes at Bernal and Monterey site

Item 8.2

From: Ashish R [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 11:19 AM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <[redacted]>; District2 [redacted]>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <[redacted]>; Sandoval, Vanessa [redacted]>; Chapman, Helen <h[redacted]>; Villarreal, Maribel <[redacted]v>; Ramirez, Lucas [redacted]>; Nguyen, Laura <[redacted]>; Hernandez, Kimberly <[redacted]>
Subject: Opposition to build Tiny Homes at Bernal and Monterey site

Mayor Liccardo, Council Member Jimenez, & other Members,
I am strongly against the idea of building tiny homes to house the homeless on lots near Bernal and Monterey. To include in the population people infected by Covid-19 is also not acceptable. This is a threat to the safety of the residential community near this site.

I'm very concerned of this move because I don't think District 2 residents along this area are adequately notified, informed of the reasons for the decision, and ultimately, the details about this community. I do not wish to be exposed to the potential problems associated with the homeless by just plopping them down in a decent neighborhood without a program to get them economically prepared to be good upstanding citizens that would uplift the neighborhood rather than loading it down with crime and sicknesses.

The city officials can come up with a more comprehensive plan that would address the root causes of the problem and not just laying it on a good neighborhood with productive decent citizens. Why not explore other sites where residential neighborhoods would not be impacted?

I would like to know how many of you who are making this decision actually live in our neighborhood. That being said, I encourage you to empathetically consider the residents' concerns and issues before taking any decision.
Respectfully,
Ashish Rastogi
Resident of MetCalf - California Maison

Taber, Toni

From: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:10 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: rent control and just cause eviction

-----Original Message-----
From: AGOSTINHO BETTENCOURT [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 11:33 AM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <[redacted]>
Subject: rent control and just cause eviction

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Liccardo,

No industry is regulated with price controls etc. as the housing industry. This is the problem not the owners who worked hard, saved and risked their savings investing in property for old age. Now we not only watch our property rights taken away by the policioons but what is our pensions .Who else is forced to share their pensions ?

Sincerely,

AGOSTINHO BETTENCOURT
[redacted]
San Jose, CA 95133
[redacted]

Taber, Toni

From: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:07 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: Emergency Order and Shelter Crisis Declaration for COVID-19 Emergency. Meeting to be held 4/21/20

From: believe333 [mailto:believe333@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 11:50 AM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo [redacted]>; District2 <[redacted]>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <J[redacted]>; Hemphill, Kelly [redacted]>; Cranford, Sandra <[redacted]>; City Clerk <c[redacted]>; Cortese, Dave <[redacted]>
Subject: Emergency Order and Shelter Crisis Declaration for COVID-19 Emergency. Meeting to be held 4/21/20

Dear Sam Liccardo and Sergio Jimenez,

I want to put on record I am opposing the Dorms being built at Monterey Hwy and Bernal Rd.

The area is not safe for humans to live on.

The city is spending too much money on this project to even consider such a proposal. You have other options, Gov Newsom has rented 6000 rooms and overall 11000 why dorms? Gov Newsom plan houses more homeless at a less expensive cost and can house more people by doing so. I strongly suggest you spend the money the wisely as our representatives. If your goal is to house, then house as many as you can and not a select few.

By using a motel, they will be provided with a shower, hot meal.

Why risk the homeless of contracting COVID-19 or other contagious diseases and attracting criminal activities to our community?

This is not just a city problem; it is a Santa Clara County Problem. Mr. Cortese should also be addressing the issue and helping with the solution. I recommend to start looking at county land that doesn't directly affect residential areas.

Regards,
P. Houston
D2 Acts & SJ Action

Taber, Toni

From: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:01 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: Please support Tiny Homes in San Jose!

From: Kim Guptill [mailto:kimguptill@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 12:12 PM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <[redacted]>
Subject: Please support Tiny Homes in San Jose!

Dear Mayor Liccardo,

As I mentioned in my phone call yesterday, I am a District 6 resident and I strongly SUPPORT building tiny homes to immediate shelter unhoused people. This crisis calls for emergency measures for the health and safety of all residents. I urge you to support Tiny Home villages in San Jose and District 6.

YIMBY!

Sincerely,

Kim Guptill
Roycott Way

Taber, Toni

From: CouncilMeeting
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:01 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: City Council 4/21 Agenda 20-489

From: Trish [mailto:pgcavnlvr@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:00 PM
To: CouncilMeeting <CouncilMeeting@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: City Council 4/21 Agenda 20-489

[External Email]

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Trish <[redacted]>
Date: April 21, 2020 at 1:57:42 PM PDT
To: City Coucil Email [redacted]
Subject: City Council 4/21 Agenda 20-489

City Council

Thank you mayor and city Council members.
As a 45 year plus resident of San Jose and nearly 30 years in the Metcalf area and in close proximity to the proposed bridge housing I have deep concerns that this project is not going through due process. I have concerns for the health of my community as this was first proposed as a 100% covered positive demographic. There are many of us that are in the high risk category if exposed to covid 19 . I have 30 years plus in the health care industry and understand the ramifications of this virus . it is unknown and unpredictable in how it will behave. Other than that one of my biggest comcens this is not being given due process for environmental impact reviews. Additionally, this bridge housing community is double the size of the one at Mayberry ,which I'm hearing is quite successful. As of now it is not impactful to the community and aesthetically pleasing. Hopefully it will be maintained that way in the future. My biggest concern is that district 2 is shouldering the entire responsibility of 80 residence and this should be shared by the entire city. If the city was to show good faith and impose on a wealthier community and district and divide this project project between two districts it would go a lot further in showing

that the city Council, the city of San Jose and the county has all of its residents unhoused and housed in mind. This is not a emocratic move by rushing this through. San Jose and Santa Clara county can be commended for placing 100 percent of known positive Covid 19 unhoused into hotels and motels. We do need to do so much for our unhoused especially during this time. The city and county have done a great job in placing our positive unhoused community into hotels and motels. We do not need to be hasty and push this through without due process. Thank you
Questions : has the CDC given guidelines on this process as we are dealing with an unpredictable disease? This would pertain to positive /or demographic to be housed
Plumbing ? This could be of serious issue if plumbing is not included.. as we know the aerosols MUST be contained and mitigated .. many studies show this virus to linger for up to 3 hours and project out from 3- possible 27 feet.
Future communication to our community..
This is a must .. mailers should have gone out to the neighborhoods impacted by this. Most of us found out by Nextdoor.
This is not responsible. Many of us are connected for updates via email that we have supplied to the city for other events including CAHSR.
Sincerely
Patricia Geyer Carlin

Metcalf

Sent from my iPhone

Taber, Toni

From: CouncilMeeting
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:01 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: City Council 4/21 Agenda 20-489

From: Trish [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 1:58 PM
To: CouncilMeeting <[redacted]>
Subject: City Council 4/21 Agenda 20-489

[External Email]

City Council

Thank you mayor and city Council members.
As a 45 year plus resident of San Jose and nearly 30 years in the Metcalf area and in close proximity to the proposed bridge housing I have deep concerns that this project is not going through due process. I have concerns for the health of my community as this was first proposed as a 100% covered positive demographic. There are many of us that are in the high risk category if exposed to covid 19 . I have 30 years plus in the health care industry and understand the ramifications of this virus . it is unknown and unpredictable in how it will behave. Other than that one of my biggest comcens this is not being given due process for environmental impact reviews. Additionally, this bridge housing community is double the size of the one at Mayberry ,which I'm hearing is quite successful. As of now it is not impactful to the community and aesthetically pleasing. Hopefully it will be maintained that way in the future. My biggest concern is that district 2 is shouldering the entire responsibility of 80 residence and this should be shared by the entire city. If the city was to show good faith and impose on a wealthier community and district and divide this project project between two districts it would go a lot further in showing that the city Council, the city of San Jose and the county has all of its residents unhoused and housed in mind. This is not a emocratic move by rushing this through. San Jose and Santa Clara county can be commended for placing 100 percent of known positive Covid 19 unhoused into hotels and motels. We do need to do so much for our unhoused especially during this time. The city and county have done a great job in placing our positive unhoused community into hotels and motels. We do not need to be hasty and push this through without due process. Thank you
Questions : has the CDC given guidelines on this process as we are dealing with an unpredictable disease? This would pertain to positive /or demographic to be housed
Plumbing ? This could be of serious issue if plumbing is not included.. as we know the aerosols MUST be contained and mitigated .. many studies show this virus to linger for up to 3 hours and project out from 3-possible 27 feet.
Future communication to our community..
This is a must .. mailers should have gone out to the neighborhoods impacted by this. Most of us found out by Nextdoor.

This is not responsible. Many of us are connected for updates via email that we have supplied to the city for other events including CAHSR.
Sincerely
Patricia Geyer Carlin

Sent from my iPhone

Taber, Toni

From: CouncilMeeting
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 1:57 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: Agenda Item #8.2: Slow response to COVID-19 crisis in unhoused community

From: kathryn hedges [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 1:28 PM
To: CouncilMeeting <C[redacted]>
Subject: Agenda Item #8.2: Slow response to COVID-19 crisis in unhoused community

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Councilmembers, and Staff:

I hope you and yours are well.

I see that the City of San Jose is joining the County of Santa Clara in making token efforts to address the dire public health crisis among our unhoused population. I'm still working on a way to distill this into a 1-2 minute comment for public comment on the item.

I am very concerned for the true situation for the unhoused community of San Jose and Santa Clara County. I live in Downtown San Jose, and any time of day or night I can see or hear unhoused people near my apartment. There are still unhoused people pushing carts, carrying large backpacks with bedrolls, or just wandering aimlessly because they have nowhere to go. Last night at 2 a.m. there was an unhoused man wrapped in a blanket, coughing his lungs out on 4th Street by the fenced tattoo parlor lot at Saint John St.

My reality contradicts the rosy picture painted by the Public Health press releases. The numbers they quote are suspiciously low when we knew before the outbreak we had about 9,700 unhoused people according to the Point In Time Count, around 6,000 of whom lived in San Jose. A few hundred have emergency housing 35 days after Shelter In Place started and this is supposed to be "Mission Accomplished"?

People I know who volunteer and work directly with unhoused people say that the numbers are indeed a small fraction of those who need assistance and it is disingenuous to promote these half-hearted measures as though they are a great achievement. San Francisco has done much more in terms of getting unhoused people into hotel rooms instead of hiding them in congregate settings where all it will take is one person with COVID-19 to infect everyone else. We know people can spread it before they are sick. There have already been incidents like that in homeless shelters as well as in nursing homes. CalTrans was doing a sweep on 280 near the 4th Street ramp recently, after all the other local agencies claim to have stopped sweeps.

The system for assigning hotel rooms to unhoused people is unnecessarily complicated. I understand you don't want to just give free hotel rooms to whoever, but I doubt that people who have a safe place to live will want to sign up for a free room just for fun in the middle of a pandemic. When people lost their homes in Santa Rosa,

local governments commandeered hotel rooms for them without taking weeks to set up a system to keep middle-class people from getting hotel rooms so they didn't have to camp outside their burned homes.

Currently the level of gatekeeping makes it as complicated to get an emergency hotel room as to get an emergency SBA loan. This is unacceptable in a matter of life or death, and for a population that is already not well equipped to navigate bureaucracies.

Imagine you live on the street and you're not really sure what's going on, but what you hear sounds pretty scary. You talk to a volunteer at a giveaway for "COVID-19 safety kits" and they are concerned about your medical history putting you at high risk of death. But they aren't sure what agency to send you to because nobody's confirmed which of the official agencies can get you an emergency hotel room. You can't call because your phone has had a dead battery for days because there's no place you can hang out and charge it any more. They try to call for you, but if anyone's answering the phone, they don't know whether or not their agency is in the program.

So you ride around on VTA with all your belongings trying to find the right agency. Finally you find one that says they can screen you, and you worry because the person ahead of you in line has been talking about their medical issues and they don't qualify as "high risk." But your medical history is a bit worse than theirs and you qualify for an emergency quarantine room... except it turns out nobody can check to see if you are on the right housing database, so you don't get a room after all. They send you to a shelter they say is safe, which turns out to be South Hall with hundreds of cots.

You run into a friend from your encampment, who was offered an emergency quarantine room--and turned it down. They explained that they'd have to abandon their tent and their camping gear because they're not allowed to put it in the room, and they didn't know what they'd do after the quarantine was over. Another friend comes over and says they were kicked out of the quarantine hotel because they left the premises to get food after they missed the delivery. They're only allowed 20 minutes of scheduled supervised break time, and of course that's when DoorDash showed up. But they couldn't cope with being locked in their room without the key, and hearing people freaking out in the room next door, so maybe it's better this way.

This is a narrative form of the information from one of the volunteers who can't get her people into the system who need to be, and who found out the way it's managed doesn't reflect people's actual needs.

This is not a humane, respectful system and it isn't even effective. Shame on Santa Clara County for pretending it's a success when it isn't. If you wouldn't want this to happen to you or a loved one, why should our unhoused people be treated this way? Why is the County signing contracts with agencies that don't have enough staff to do the work and isn't hiring more staff in the emergency? Why didn't the agencies start planning before they had active COVID-19 cases in the shelters?

We need to remove all these roadblocks to get people off the streets and into emergency quarantine housing with proper support and plans for an exit strategy.

- People need storage so they aren't faced with losing camping gear they need after they're released
- People need long-term housing after Shelter In Place anyway
- People need aid workers who can provide mental health or addiction counseling to help manage the traumatic situation/environment and prevent them from getting dysregulated and acting out
- People need more support for their food needs instead of having to arrange for their own food to be delivered
- People should not be treated like they're in a jail or other institution when we offer them a safe place to stay

The way the County of Santa Clara is handling the pandemic in the unhoused community is not acceptable. We could commandeer enough hotel rooms for everyone and get everyone off the streets by Friday at the latest, and most people by Wednesday night.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Hedges
[redacted]
San Jose, CA 95112

Taber, Toni

From: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:26 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: Council Meeting 4/21

From: David Nettemeyer [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 10:09 AM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <T[redacted]>
Subject: Council Meeting 4/21

[External Email]

Dear Mayor's Office,
Following up on my other emails in regard to the vote on "**8.2 20-489 Actions Related to the Homeless Housing Assistance and Prevention Grant from the State of California**", I would further like to address councilmember Jimenez's email and memorandum that was sent just last night, for the first and only outreach this year from him and the City about this fast-tracked project.

My previous email questioning if the site is **NOT** intended for currently confirmed positive COVID-19 individuals still stands or whether this will be **mandated** that no confirmed positive COVID-19 individuals will be housed here.

If it is mandated that they will not be housed here, then why is the City using these funds for the development? Correct me if I'm wrong, but is the City just exploiting the deregulated state so they can fast-track this development because they can?

I would like to point out that the way the City has rushed this, is exploiting the deregulated state, and is using the guise of COVID-19 to fast-track this tiptoes on the lines of unethical practices. Personally, I would be ashamed to have my name attached to a 'Yes' vote for this.

Next, in regards to councilmember Jimenez's memorandum. Will there be parking at this location? From what I can tell, there is no space for parking here. Is the City planning on tearing out the trees to fit this? His memorandum only answers a small fraction of the questions that were presented to the City in my previous emails.

Finally, I have sent this, and multiple emails to all the proper addresses to have it recorded. I currently do not see my emails associated with the meeting, or that of fellow community members who have emailed the proper channels. I hope that the City will associate all emails with the meeting today so all councilmembers are completely aware of the concerns the community has. I also hope the community will see the eComments that were left on this agenda item, even though it is having server errors right now.

Again, I implore you, as a representative of the people, to stand against this and vote no on agenda item "**8.2 20-489 Actions Related to the Homeless Housing Assistance and Prevention Grant from the State of California**" in today's meeting until the City has a real understanding of how they can fully support this location, meet all regulatory standards, and provide the proper services to help resolve California's current homelessness crisis.

Best Regards,
David Nettemeyer

Taber, Toni

From: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 2:27 PM
To: Agendadesk
Subject: FW: Opposed to rushed building with little outreach and transparency of 80 home tiny homes

---

From: Scott Johnson [mailto:s[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 10:09 AM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <T[redacted]>
Subject: Opposed to rushed building with little outreach and transparency of 80 home tiny homes

[External Email]

Mayor Licardo,

I have traditionally agreed with many of the actions and plans you have done for this pandemic. I am deeply disappointed and frustrated with the expedited process in building these homes in my community. I am not opposed to a thorough and complete process in evaluation where the community has input on the process. However, along the way there were concerns about this location and the screening of who will be living in these home. We were told that it would not move forward without community input and outreach.

My main concern is what is the restrictions and what are the stipulations for residing in these homes?

RESTRICTIONS:
I am hopeful you will not be allowing sex offenders, violent offenders (parole and probation) and severe mental health (people who are a danger to themselves and others) from being considered for these residences.

STIPULATIONS:
Once residing at these locations what are the rules for continuing to stay there. This is important as if they are being disruptive to the community there should be a process for them to be removed. This process should be communicated and clear to not only anyone living there but to the community near this location. As a side note, the location has guarantee security for 1 year and then it is re-evaluated. It seems these locations should have 24 hour security during the time they are allowed in these locations and it seems the 1 year is just to appease concerns temporarily.

After following this project over the last several years the timing and rush to do this leaves a poor opinion with the project and reasons. The explanation now is that it needs to be done for COVID-19, The interesting part is in the article for the mercury news it states they will be used for quarantine and housing for Covid-19 but in your newsletter it is said they will not be. Either way this pandemic seems like an excuse to build what the City Council has wanted to do. Placing 80+ people in homes condensed and sharing space is not the answer for preventing the spread of COVID-19. It seems it will only create a potential for spread in the community it is placed into.

As a volunteer for multiple organization in this area the negatives to the families who are residing in this lower middle class area are high. It seems in the zest to rush to place houses the lower middle class neighborhoods are continuing to carry the burden. I don't see these projects getting placed in Almaden, Rose Garden and Evergreen Hills.

Sincerely,

Scott Johnson

Resident/ Active volunteer

Renee Johnson
Resident/ Teacher

No to Tiny Homes in District 2

Steven Love
Wed 4/22/2020 11:56 PM

I don't want to see tiny homes in my backyard when the city can use other unincorporated land where the homes can be built out of site from established neighborhoods where taxpayers pay high property taxes. The city should be responsible for figuring out how to route public transportation to these unincorporated areas that won't affect property values in established neighborhoods. I would be interested to know how many elected city officials would want tiny homes in their neighborhoods.

--

Steven O. Love

Fwd: Please don’t build tiny houses on Bernal and Monteray

Bimal Tripathi
Wed 4/22/2020 6:22 PM

What is proposed is not a comprehensive plan. There are no mental health and medical facilities in this area. From traffic perspective, it is not safe. We already have homeless people on the banks of Coyote creek and this will further compound the community issues.

As Our ELECTED official, please know that you do have your constituents support. Where's our representation and how come there is inadequate notification? Clearly this is a unpopular unworkable plan.

A concerned San Jose Resident

Tiny homes

John Baptiste
Wed 4/22/2020 4:33 PM

This is a bad idea and needs to be rethought. Im not in favor of this issue. John baptiste
Sent from my iPhone