

**Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)**

Wil Vigeant <[REDACTED]>

Mon 11/28/2022 8:11 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Good day,

NO EIH at Cottle VTA, Homeless EIH should not be built near residential areas.

Resident of 95123

Thanks

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)

C Walk <[REDACTED]>

Mon 11/28/2022 8:49 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello City Council Members,

I am sending this email to show my **opposition** to building Homeless EIH units at the Cottle VTA parking lot. I am a VTA rider and am opposed to the use of the parking lot for any purpose other than parking cars during the week. Our cars will not be safe and neither will we.

The City has other more suitable properties, use them.

The City should also look at more permanent and cost effective solutions.

Regards,

Chris Walker

10th District Resident

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file #22-1748)

Phuong Nguyen <[REDACTED]>

Mon 11/28/2022 10:17 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

[External Email]

To whom this may concern:

I am a homeowner near the Cottle VTA that is being proposed to build Homeless EIH. I am very concerned with the proposal as I have small children who attend school nearby as well riding their bikes to the park nearby. Our community believes that Homeless EIH should not be built near residential areas. We are against it because this will put about 65% of homeless transitional housing within 1.5 mile radius near our neighborhood. This site represents a serious endangerment of public safety and public health. It is close to day care centers (eg Bright Horizon, Catalyst Kids, Tuplic Kids), elementary schools and senior center. The EIH site is located at a heavily used highway on-ramp. It will create traffic jams and safety issues. We are against the proposal because no community concerns have been considered and no public environmental impact studies have been performed.

Please reconsider and say NO to Homeless EIH at Cottle VTA.

Sincerely,  
Phuong Nguyen

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Agenda Item 8.3 - No EIH at Cottle VTA

Linda Linjun Xu <[REDACTED]>

Mon 11/28/2022 11:34 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I write to express concerns and opposition to the City's proposal to build an EIH at the VTA parking lot on Cottle Road.

First, the surrounding neighborhoods have already been overburdened by temporary housing programs. For example, within the 1.5 mile radius of the Cottle VTA, there are two established EIH sites (Rue Ferrari, Bernel & Monterey) which host 158 units of EIH. Additional EIHs have also been planned in this area including 204 units at Monterey & Branham and an expansion of Rue Ferrari which will get another 100 beds. In total, this represents over 40% of the EIHs of the entire city of San Jose. If the Cottle VTA site (with 100 units) is approved, the same 1.5 mile radius will house over 50% of the EIHs for the entire city of San Jose. In addition to the EIHs, this area has additional affordable housing planned such as Santa Teresa & Lean, as well as RV parking at Santa Teresa VTA station. San Jose is a big city with 10 districts. Each community needs to take the responsibility of helping the unhoused. Building a majority of EIHs and temporary housing in such a small area is plainly unfair to the local community and is not a sustainable long-term solution.

Second, the Cottle VTA is close to schools, daycare centers, and senior centers, many of which are within walking distance. For example, Cottle VTA is close to day care centers (e.g., Bright Horizon, Catalyst Kids, Tulip Kids), elementary schools (e.g., Oak Ridge, Alex Anderson, Peach Blossom), and senior center (e.g., Southside Senior Center). It is also right next to Kaiser hospital. These locations are frequented and used by the most vulnerable people in our society, such as children, elders, and people with restricted abilities to move. The EIH program does not have a mechanism to protect those vulnerable people from the impact brought by the site or otherwise ensure the health and safety of the surrounding areas. As one example, the EIH program at Rue Ferrari is managed by HomeFirst, which has a very low barrier for determining eligibility. The HomeFirst's website specifically states that it "eliminate[s] as many requirements as [it] can to ease entry (E.g., entrance does not require sobriety)". <https://www.homefirstscc.org/programs>. This "eased" requirement inevitably fails to separate those who truly need help from those who present public safety concerns (such as drug addicts, alcoholics, etc.). Also, the city is planning to bring the unhoused from other areas of the city into the newly constructed site, which further exacerbates public safety issues.

Moreover, Cottle VTA is close to residential areas, where the Oak Ridge and Anderson East neighborhoods are across the street within one block from the Cottle VTA. Building an EIH in such a close proximity to residential areas is an irresponsible idea. Currently, there is no way to ensure that individuals who prefer living on the street and yet want to use the free services provided by EIH, will not endanger the health and safety of the neighborhoods (e.g., by building illegal camps in the neighborhoods).

Third, the proposed EIH at Cottle VTA will cause traffic jams and decrease the community's mobility. The proposed EIH is at the on-ramp to highway 85. It will create traffic congestion at an already busy intersection. Furthermore, the Cottle VTA station is actively used by the community riders. As shown in the example satellite image below from pre-covid (i.e., May 2018), the Cottle VTA station is a park & ride location where many people park there to take the light rail. With Covid receding, the ridership is expected to return to the pre-covid period. By turning three acres of parking lot into an EIH site, parking spots will be reduced which will in turn dissuade community riders. Moreover, as there won't be enough parking spots, those who previously took the light rail will drive instead, which further worsens the traffic congestion on the 85 on-ramp intersection. The end result will be a traffic bottleneck at the ramp intersection in front of the EIH site.



Cottle VTA is not the right location for an EIH. It is unfair to the local community, and creates public health and safety concerns that cannot be mitigated.

Sincerely,  
Linda

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Agenda Item 8.3 (file #22-1748)

The Van Huystees <[REDACTED]>

Mon 11/28/2022 11:48 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

[External Email]

I am sending this email to vehemently oppose the idea of another planned EIH project within my district at the Cottle VTA parking area.

This is wrong from so many perspectives:

- 1) It disproportionately distributes homeless EIH facilities within a small radius of the city, specifically my immediate neighborhood.
- 2) When the multi story/high density housing(apartments and condos) were planned for the cottle VTA area, it was under the guise this would be a commuter hub. Taking up the parking with tiny homes is inconsistent with that vision. Which is it, a commuter hub or a homeless encampment?
- 3) The inevitable drug/alcohol use and mental health issues innate in the target population to be housed will pose a public safety concern. It will similarly pose a huge liability for city taxpayers. Who will get sued when crime results in assaults, death, property damage, and residents burning the tiny homes down around themselves? It is common for the addicted to start inadvertent fires when they pass out while high. There is typically at least one fire a year caused by the homeless that camp behind the fence at my work on San Ignacio Ave. so I have real, personal, experience on which I base this concern.
- 4) EIH developments negatively impact housing prices in the area resulting in lower home sale prices and hence lower property tax revenues for the city and county. The obvious conclusion is that the city council feels they already have an excess of tax revenues to cover all the important initiatives our city must address and can do with less, especially since the EIH development is not free to build.

Once each city council member and the mayor personally have at least one EIH within two miles of their personal residence, then we can talk about more in my neighborhood.

sincerely, Loren Van Huystee

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Item number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)

gun eet sondhi <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 8:17 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

We don't want any kind of construction of any tiny house. This a safe area , and we don't want any criminals in our area. Plus if you are so concerned give them jobs in your office so that they can afford housing themselves. There is lot of empty lands and city has top construction companies which can construct affordable houses for them and give them jobs too. But my house is not for shelter. No to tiny homes. Thanks Resident cottle rd.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

**Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file #22-1748)**

Norind Su <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 8:27 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

We're against Tiny Homes at Cottle VTA.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)

Ravi Raj <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 8:39 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I and my wife live on Larchmont Drive in San Jose, CA, 95123 and I am writing this email with respect to the idea of building a Homeless EIH at Cottle VTA.

I am against this idea and do NOT want the Homeless EIH to be built near the residential areas. Few reasons which I can think of for saying NO this idea are like below :

- 1) This site would represent endangerment of public safety and public health. It is close to day care centers ( like Tulip Kids, Bright Horizon), elementary schools ( Oak Ridge, Alex Anderson, Peach Blossom), and senior center ( Southside Senior Center).
- 2) Cottle VTA is used by many neighbors and Kaiser patients. The EIH site is located at a heavily used highway on-ramp. It will create traffic jams and safety issues.
- 3) Our neighbourhood is already disproportionately burdened by the City's homeless programs. The city puts about 65% of homeless transitional housing within 1.5 miles radius near our neighborhood.

Hence, please consider this email as my vote of NO to the building of Homeless EIH at Cottle VTA.

Thank you  
Ravi

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

**Agenda item number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)**

Linda Cerates <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 8:44 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

[External Email]

I feel that tiny homes on the VTA Cottle sight is not a good decision. The sight is too close to the heavily used highway on-ramp and will create traffic jams and safety issues. It is also close to schools, children's care facilities and the Southside Senior Center. There are many residents who walk daily in the neighborhood and will not feel as secure as they should. Tiny homes should be build, but not in such a busy residential area.

Linda

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Against EIH at Cottle VTA Station Item No. 8.3 (file #22-1748)

Roy Chen <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 9:19 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Madam/Sir

We are totally against the EIH at Cattle VTA station based on following Reasons:

1. We agree all the reasons the local community handed out and presented to you. No repeat here.
2. It caught us by surprise that the city is making decision without fully consulting the most impacted community. It's has less effort than if my neighbor want to modify their house or put solar panel on their roof. We heard the June decision just a few weeks ago and the decision seems not reversible. That is complete not acceptable!!
3. Our community volunteers start to distribute the information this holiday weekend. We don't see city's efforts in this regard at all. We like to see the following/not limited to information:
  1. Full evaluation of each of the site in the area
  2. Options in other areas of the city.
  3. Effectiveness of EIH in California. Comparing to New York City has major frauds. It's complete different weather condition, a few feet of snow on the ground in winter, not here in San Jose!
  4. Security, not only in the EIH facility but more importantly the neighborhood. How do you make sure the security in the neighboring communities is not degrading ?
4. We just got chance to voice our concern/opinion now. Council members only have a few minutes to vote after listening to the voice of the local community. The vote shouldn't happen and must be delayed at least! Imagine it's your own home, your own community. You are there OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE!!!

Sincerely,

Liana and Roy

[REDACTED]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)

NHAN LE <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 9:43 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

I am a quadriplegic who uses the Cottle Light Rail station regularly. I am very concerned about my safety with Homeless EIH at Cottle VTA.

Nhan Le

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Agenda item Number 8.3 (file # 22-1748 )

WORK SMART < [REDACTED] >

Tue 11/29/2022 9:52 AM

To: City Clerk < [REDACTED] > CouncilMeeting < [REDACTED] >

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Sirs,

I do not support Tiny Homes at Cottle VTA for the following reasons -  
Homeless will cause an increase in crime, drug activity and loitering in the area. In addition, housing homeless people near the VTA station will cause more people to stop using public transportation.

I have lived in the neighborhood for 22 years and will not support tiny homes at Cottle. We already have various housing facilities for low income families all over the 95123 area. Other parts of San Jose should step up and take responsibility for housing the homeless.

Sincerely,  
Luis Garcia

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## agenda item 8.3 - city council meeting 11.29.22

Lorraine Zeller <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 9:56 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Cc: District9 <[REDACTED]>

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Members of San Jose City Council,

My name is Lorraine Zeller. I am a constituent of Pam Foley's District 9 and am writing as a member of SURJ at Sacred Heart, speaking in solidarity with RECS and SOS at Sacred Heart.

This issue is important to me because my daughter was homeless, thankfully many years ago. Also, being retired and on a very limited income, I could very well be on the streets if I hadn't been fortunate enough to find affordable housing myself. So I speak in solidarity with my peers who are not as fortunate and pray that they too will be allowed affordable housing and be treated with dignity and respect.

So, in solidarity with my community, I ask the council to approve new emergency interim housing and the staff recommendation for more services and outreach at all emergency interim housing (EIH) sites, and more funding for our city workers to provide those services. I support the staff recommendation not to implement no encampment zones and am opposed to any measures that would increase the criminalization of our unhoused neighbors.

As city staff themselves point out (p. 19), "Having access to emergency housing is an equity issue for people in need." And access to emergency housing varies widely across city council districts. There is an urgent need for emergency housing in half of the city council districts (1, 4, 8, 9 and 10).

The staff report from the City Housing Department pointed out that our most vulnerable people with disabilities and chronic health conditions are most in need of housing assistance. According to city staff (p. 11), "There are approximately 5,389 unsheltered individuals in the community housing queue. The City and County of Santa Clara use coordinated entry for housing, using the same housing queue. ..In this region, the most vulnerable individuals are prioritized for housing. Some data on those individuals in the housing queue:

- 72% have a disabling condition
- 50% are age 45 and older
- 36% have chronic health issues
- 7% are families with children
- 5% are transitional aged-youth
- 3% are veterans

Considering potential implementation of no encampment zones requires the constant abatement of individuals experiencing homelessness. The process of abatement is traumatic for unsheltered individuals because they may lose their sense of safety and material belongings that can cause unintended repercussions to their ability to recover from homelessness. Abating individuals experiencing homelessness also disproportionately affects minority populations and people with disabilities.

Please keep in mind that survival is not a crime. We need more housing, not more criminalization of those who are unhoused.

If we are to love our neighbors, we must make sure that the most vulnerable among us have safe shelter.

Best regards and many thanks for your public service.

Lorraine Zeller

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Agenda Item 8.3 (file #22-1748)

Talat Khan <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 9:58 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello,

I share serious concern regarding the EIH at Cottle VTA due to following reasons:

- 1) Serious concern to safety of my family members
- 2) Within heavy traffic during rush ours
- 3) The site is heavily used for parking
- 4) Sits into an emergency hospital area and needs constant security
- 5) Site is very close to several childcare centers in the area (Bright Horizon, Tulip Kids, Catalyst Kids)

Thank you,  
Talat

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



## No Tiny Homes at Cottle VTA Regarding Agenda item Number 8.3 (file #22-1748)

Kim Mai <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 9:59 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Clerk of San Jose,

# No Tiny Homes at Cottle VTA

Why we are against this:

1. Our neighborhood is disproportionately burdened by the City's homeless programs. The city puts about 65% of homeless transitional housing within 1.5 mile radius near our neighborhood.
2. This site represents a serious endangerment of public safety and public health. It is close to day care centers, elementary schools, and senior center.
3. VTA parking lot is for VTA riders. The Cottle VTA is used by many neighbors and Kaiser patients. The EIH site is located at a heavily used highway on-ramp. It will create traffic jams and safety issues.
4. No community concerns have been considered. No public environment impact studies have been performed.

HOMELESS EIH SHOULD NOT BE BUILT NEAR RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Best Regards,

Kim Mai and Hung Le

[REDACTED]

San Jose

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

No Tiny Homes at Cottle VTA Regarding Agenda item Number 8.3 (file #22-1748)

Hung Le <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 10:26 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Clerk of San Jose,

## No Tiny Homes at Cottle VTA

Why we are against this:

1. Why the 3rd one? There's already 2 City approved homeless sites (Monterey and Bernal Rd) and (Rue Ferrari and Highway 101)
2. Our neighborhood is disproportionately burdened by the City's homeless programs. The city puts about 65% of homeless transitional housing within a 1.5 mile radius near our neighborhood.
3. This site represents a serious endangerment of public safety and public health. It is close to day care centers, elementary schools, senior centers, and hospitals.
4. VTA parking lot is for VTA riders. The Cottle VTA is used by many neighbors and Kaiser patients. The EIH site is located at a heavily used highway on-ramp. It will create traffic jams and safety issues.
5. No community concerns have been considered. No public environment impact studies have been performed.

Best regards,

Hung Le

[REDACTED]  
San Jose, CA 95123

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Comment for: 1:30 p.m. Nov. 29 - Agenda Item 8.3 City Initiatives Roadmap - Emergency Housing System Expansion. etc.

Carolyn Straub <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 11:08 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

[External Email]

City Clerk and City Council,

" to maintain quality of life in neighborhoods surrounding current and future Emergency Interim Housing and Bridge Housing Community sites through the provision of dedicated monitoring, reporting, blight reduction, community engagement, and housing resources to communities within a 10 minute/~half-mile walkshed of existing Emergency Interim Housing/Bridge Housing Community sites. .."

Whatever the above means, somewhere in this is a concern by the city's residents about their property.

The concern should be focused on bettering the City of San Jose with proper housing for the homeless.

There are too many objections by neighbors, and these all contribute to the city's deterioration.

**We support interim housing for the homeless. It should not be opposed.**

Please consider this tonight in your deliberations.

The opposing neighbors have not been helpful to the city's betterment so far, and not even realistic. This housing will be staffed, one hopes. What is the problem with housing the homeless other than money to do so.

Thank you for your interest.

Carolyn Straub  
Stephen McHenry  
San Jose District 7

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Item Number 8.3 (file #22-1748)

Dan Thach <[REDACTED]>

Tue 11/29/2022 11:42 AM

To: CouncilMeeting <[REDACTED]>

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Mahan, Matt

Cc: Matt Mahan <[REDACTED]>

Arenas, Sylvia <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello,

I live within less than 1 mile of this location and I strongly oppose this, as well as all the people at San Jose Action group.

It is unthinkable that the SJC is even considering a location next to the hospital, within walking distance of a large shopping center, and highway. It will have a major economic impact on the location.

@ [REDACTED], @Silvia, @Johnny, you have my family, friends, and extended family votes on this very issue. I advocated for all of you in the San Jose Action group and promoted your candidacies like a broken record at all family, and friends gatherings.

My hope is that you will deliver so I can continue to support you in the next term.

Thank you,  
-Dan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Agenda Item 8.3

briena brown [REDACTED]

Tue 11/29/2022 8:29 PM

To: District3 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hi my name is Briena Brown from District 3 and I am a member of RECS at Sacred Heart, speaking in solidarity with SOS at Sacred Heart.

This issue matters to me because my father was previously unhoused and I have worked very closely with unhoused students and residents in San Jose.

Approving no encampment zones would severely affect unhoused individuals by displacing members of their community. Most of our unhoused neighbors consider other members of their encampment as family and displacing their loved ones seems to be an unnecessarily cruel thing to do to a community who already is struggling to survive.

*I ask the council to approve new emergency interim housing and the staff recommendation for more services and outreach at ALL emergency interim housing (EIH) sites, and MORE funding for our city workers to provide those services. I support the staff recommendation NOT to implement no encampment zones and am opposed to any measures that would increase the criminalization of our unhoused neighbors.*

Thank you for your time.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

**Fw: Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)**

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 9:40 AM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

*How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)*

---

**From:** Wil Vigeant <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:56 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Agenda Item Number 8.3 (file # 22-1748)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

NO Tiny Homes at Cottle VTA, Homeless EIH Should Not Be Built Near Residential Areas.

Thanks,

Resident of 95123

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.