

**From:** David Bird < >  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 7, 2017 2:51 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Bridge Housing

I would like to record my support for the Bridge Housing item to be discussed by Council on Tuesday at 1:30pm. I also hope to be present for the debate.

David Bird  
Dean, Trinity Cathedral, 81 North 2 Street

**From:** Bogo Share < >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 6, 2017 5:39 PM  
**To:** BridgeHousingCommunities  
**Cc:** District1; Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; District2; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10  
**Subject:** Distance to schools should be minimum criteria when considering sites for tiny home

Hi,

My neighbor passed me the attached memo regarding your updated criteria for selecting tiny home locations. Pleased that buffering distance to houses and schools are back on the list. However, they are not treated as minimum requirement like lot size and access to water and electricity. Proximity to tiny home is by far neighbor's biggest concern. We strongly request using distance to houses and residential areas as filtering criteria.

The cost is mind-blowing to build the tiny homes. We suggest you to consider councilman Tam's suggestion to replace cabins with encampment. This will for sure help more homeless population with equivalent resources. <http://www.mercurynews.com/2017/12/04/san-jose-tiny-homes-for-homeless-plan-back-for-second-push/>

Yours,  
Bogo

**From:** Alfonso Flores <>

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 6:45 AM

**To:** BridgeHousingCommunities

**Cc:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; City Clerk

**Subject:** Re: Bridge Housing Communities - 12/12/2017 City Council Agenda

Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk:

As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose. We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis.

However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, at the earliest. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement once the BHC plan is approved by Council." Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious.

Mr. Mayor and Council Members, NOW is the time to take action to address the serious and escalating problem of homelessness in San Jose. We want long-term comprehensive solutions - not trendy Band-Aid solutions that are expensive, time-consuming, and controversial, while providing assistance ONLY to a very few.

Here is what we think should be done:

1. FIRST AND FOREMOST: ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT CREATE HOMELESSNESS IN THE FIRST PLACE.

- For those with mental health and addiction issues, create inpatient treatment facilities staffed by doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, social workers, and drug addiction counselors who will work with people to address and treat the issues that led to them to living on the street. Successful completion of these programs must be a requirement for people to transition to permanent housing. Outpatient social workers should continue to counsel them to ensure that they do not return to homelessness.

- For those who do not suffer from addiction or mental illness, provide centers where they can find job training and resources for job searches. • Prevent homelessness by creating an office that provides grants for people who face eviction due to temporary loss of income.

2. Add to the existing housing supply. • Purchase units in existing manufactured home communities. • Establish campground-like facilities for those living in their campers or RVs. • Streamline the regulations for in-law units and promote their implementation. • Purchase homes in each district to house up to 6 tenants, as suggested by one of the council members several months ago. • Provide affordable board-and-care homes for those who require more care. (Currently, the cost is around \$4000.00 per bed. No wonder so many mentally ill people are on the streets.) • Require developers to include moderate and low-income units in new housing developments. • Work with other cities in Santa Clara County to increase moderate and low-income housing supply. • Negotiate with Silicon Valley companies, such as Apple and Google, to contribute financially to these efforts.

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Alfonso F.

**From:** santosh mahendra <>

**Sent:** Sunday, December 10, 2017 10:36 PM

**To:** District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10;  
The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; City Clerk

**Subject:** Regarding the Tiny Homes/Bridge Housing Issue

Good morning,

Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk:

As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose.

We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis. However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, at the earliest. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement once the BHC plan is approved by Council." Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious.

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Santosh Mahendra

**From:** zhao flying <

**Sent:** Sunday, December 10, 2017 11:28 PM

**To:** Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; BridgeHousingCommunities; Rork, Christopher; Duenas, Norberto; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; Pham, Kieulan; contact@lanforsanjose.com; Customer Service

**Subject:** Concern about putting homeless shelter in residential area

Dear all,

Me and my family are really concerned about setting up homeless shelters in Residential Area, especially close to schools, parks. The housing problem are not caused by the residents but the tech industry. They should take the responsibility for housing those lost their homes. But you are throwing the burden back to tax-payers who already paid their hard-earned salary to help those in need. Locating the shelters next to schools and parks is catastrophic. The bottom line is no drug users and vagrants close to the kids!

Best Regards,

Zhao's family@North San Jose

**From:** desim789 < >

**Sent:** Sunday, December 10, 2017 1:19 PM

**To:** City Clerk

**Subject:** Homeless

Not in dist 2

Happy Connecting. Sent from my Sprint Samsung Galaxy S® 5

**From:** Mila Heally < >

**Sent:** Sunday, December 10, 2017 1:22 AM

**To:** City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; BridgeHousingCommunities; District 10; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; Bramson, Ray; District1; District7; District8; District9

**Subject:** BHC - suggestion

Dear City leaders,

After reviewing your current memo about tools to address homeless housing and the cost it seems to me that:

The cost for these homeless pods is absolutely **outrageous** for 40 persons while we have another 4,000 that won't benefit at all. I believe that the goal should be cost effectiveness to address homelessness and not to run a pilot program that will only benefit a few. If people have health issues they need a nursing place or a hospital, if people have other serious issues they need something with services wrap around 24/7 like an institution or assisted living not a pod.

Here is the cost of different solutions and see how out you are with your proposal:

- **Coroplast homeless emergency cabin - cost: \$100.00 per unit**

<http://thetinylife.com/tiny-cloroplast-house/>

Pros: inexpensive, can be sanitized spraying bleach, cost effective, the material provides some thermal isolation, creative and be easily disposed later.

Cons: used for temporary housing in the event of a disaster or homeless, it can get pretty dirty overtime but cleanable.

- **Seattle model tiny homes - cost: \$2,200.00 per unit**

<https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/tiny-houses-have-a-big-impact/>

Pros: community engagement building, thermal isolation, inexpensive, developed by specialists in tiny homes and already in use.

Cons: design is not so contemporary.

- **Tuff sheds - cost: Budget: \$500,000 plus donations for 2 years**

<http://www.eastbaytimes.com/2017/12/04/oakland-opens-first-safe-haven-sanctioned-homeless-encampment/>

Pros: Faster delivery, less expensive, easy to assemble

Cons:

- **Amazon tiny homes kits - \$4,300 - 6,700 per unit**

[https://www.amazon.com/Allwood-Kit-Cabin-Lillevilla-Escape/dp/B00076AL5W/ref=sr\\_1\\_4?ie=UTF8&qid=1512787575&sr=8-4&keywords=tiny+homes](https://www.amazon.com/Allwood-Kit-Cabin-Lillevilla-Escape/dp/B00076AL5W/ref=sr_1_4?ie=UTF8&qid=1512787575&sr=8-4&keywords=tiny+homes)

### **WHAT DO I SUPPORT?**

**I support councilman Khamis and Rocha's memo 100%!**

We are having a housing crisis and the cost for 40 units that will benefit just a few is outrageous.

You are also creating a social issue emphasizing the difference for those who live in these pods as different or that they have less value because they need to live in a strange locations and in something that is not a real home.

Just use the current infrastructure and house people as they are like anyone else. Let the county to share responsibility. Those with serious issues need special attention and a BHC in a cloverleaf is not a place for that.

So just **treat people equally** and subsidize units that can be used for rapid rehousing and master lease plan. The goal should be cost effectiveness and more people that will be housed. People can go to services nearby or have a more customized type of services with money saved from not building the pods but using these funds towards services.

I think is **degrading** to try to use strange things to house people instead of just discretely allow them to feel like they used be before becoming homeless and forget they were homeless someday. OR just buy motels and hotels and house tem quickly into regular housing like anybody else and those with issues into the right places to address their problems.

Instead of focusing into innovating in temporary housing, maybe try to shift the focus into developing permanent housing that is cost effective and vertical.

Here is a sample of something innovative and futuristic. Future is space saving, cost efficient and blends in.

**THIS IS A FUTURISTIC SAN JOSE, NOT WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED. VERTICAL AND RATIONAL USE OF SPACE.**

<https://www.highsnobiety.com/p/honeycomb-homeless-neighborhoods/>

Regards,

Mila Heally – D2 resident

---

**From:** Mary Anne Devine < >  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 9, 2017 8:33 AM  
**To:** District8; City Clerk  
**Subject:** Bridge Housing Vote on 12/12/2017

Good morning, Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk:

As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose.

We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis. However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, *at the earliest*. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement **once the BHC plan is approved by Council.**" Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious.

Mr. Mayor and Council Members, NOW is the time to take action to address the serious and escalating problem of homelessness in San Jose. We want long-term comprehensive solutions - not trendy Band-Aid solutions that are expensive, time-consuming, and controversial, while providing assistance ONLY to a very few.

Here is what we think should be done:

**1. FIRST AND FOREMOST: ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT CREATE HOMELESSNESS IN THE FIRST PLACE.**

- **For those with mental health and addiction issues, create inpatient treatment facilities staffed by doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, social workers, and drug addiction counselors who will work with people to address and treat the issues that led to them to living on the street. Successful completion of these programs must be a requirement for people to transition to permanent housing. Outpatient social workers should continue to counsel them to ensure that they do not return to homelessness.**
- **For those who do not suffer from addiction or mental illness, provide centers where they can find job training and resources for job searches.**
- **Prevent homelessness by creating an office that provides grants for people who face eviction due to temporary loss of income.**

**2. Add to the existing housing supply.**

- **Purchase units in existing manufactured home communities.**
- **Establish campground-like facilities for those living in their campers or RVs.**
- **Streamline the regulations for in-law units and promote their implementation.**
- **Purchase homes in each district to house up to 6 tenants, as suggested by one of the council members several months ago.**

- **Provide affordable board-and-care homes for those who require more care. (Currently, the cost is around \$4000.00 per bed. No wonder so many mentally ill people are on the streets.)**
- **Require developers to include moderate and low-income units in new housing developments.**
- **Work with other cities in Santa Clara County to increase moderate and low-income housing supply.**
- **Negotiate with Silicon Valley companies, such as Apple and Google, to contribute financially to these efforts.**

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Mary Anne Devine  
[www.sanjoseaction.com](http://www.sanjoseaction.com)



---

**From:** jerry booth < >

**Sent:** Saturday, December 9, 2017 8:07 AM

**To:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; District1; City Clerk

**Subject:** Oakland's plan

To the Mayor and the Council,

As I understand the tiny home urgency, it was important to get people off the street before the worst weather hits us. Please take Oakland's lead and do something similar instead of beating the issue of these expensive architect designed pods into the ground. Do it outside of any residential neighborhoods, and you will have very little pushback! Why persist in alienating your constituents and causing such anxiety and opposition in your hardworking, tax paying residents? This battle is not necessary to achieve what you want to achieve. People will never be happy if these temporary housing remedies are placed in neighborhoods and it will be a decision that will follow many of you to the voting booths. Please listen to the voices of San Jose.

Oakland's plan will:

1. Cost \$3000 for tuff sheds temporary housing, a savings of over \$50,000/unit compared to San Jose's plan.
2. House 3 times as many people
3. Allow quick move in before the worst weather hits and can possibly even begin this winter in San Jose rather than a 12 month estimated time from start to finish per SJ's Housing Dept.

4. Not place these communities in residential areas which alleviates one of the primary concerns of SJ residents

See the below article:

<http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/matier-ross/article/Mayor-wants-Oakland-to-install-its-own-navigation-12230688.php>

Why continue to fight this battle at the expense of providing shelter to the homeless now??

G. Booth  
district 2

---

**From:** Mila Heally <

**Sent:** Sunday, December 10, 2017 1:48 AM

**To:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; BridgeHousingCommunities; District 10; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; Bramson, Ray; District1; District7; District8; District9; City Clerk

**Subject:** Re: BHC - suggestion

City Leaders,

Here is the link to what is a futuristic approach for vertical permanent housing that can be used by anyone not only homeless. Your bridge housing community design is yesterday!  
This is what I believe San Jose needs to go towards vertical!

<https://www.framlab.com/homed>

Sincerely,

Mila Heally - D2

On Sun, Dec 10, 2017 at 1:22 AM, Mila Heally < > wrote:  
Dear City leaders,

After reviewing your current memo about tools to address homeless housing and the cost it seems to me that:

The cost for these homeless pods is absolutely **outrageous** for 40 persons while we have another 4,000 that won't benefit at all. I believe that the goal should be cost effectiveness to address homelessness and not to run a pilot program that will only benefit a few. If people have health issues they need a nursing place or a hospital, if people have other serious issues they need something with services wrap around 24/7 like an institution or assisted living not a pod.

Here is the cost of different solutions and see how out you are with your proposal:

- **Coroplast homeless emergency cabin - cost: \$100.00 per unit**

<http://thetinylife.com/tiny-cloroplast-house/>

Pros: inexpensive, can be sanitized spraying bleach, cost effective, the material provides some thermal isolation, creative and be easily disposed later.

Cons: used for temporary housing in the event of a disaster or homeless, it can get pretty dirty overtime but cleanable.

- **Seattle model tiny homes - cost: \$2,200.00 per unit**

<https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/tiny-houses-have-a-big-impact/>

Pros: community engagement building, thermal isolation, inexpensive, developed by specialists in tiny homes and already in use.

Cons: design is not so contemporary.

- **Tuff sheds - cost: Budget: \$500,000 plus donations for 2 years**

<http://www.eastbaytimes.com/2017/12/04/oakland-opens-first-safe-haven-sanctioned-homeless-encampment/>

Pros: Faster delivery, less expensive, easy to assemble

Cons:

- **Amazon tiny homes kits - \$4,300 - 6,700 per unit**

[https://www.amazon.com/Allwood-Kit-Cabin-Lillevilla-Escape/dp/B00076AL5W/ref=sr\\_1\\_4?ie=UTF8&qid=1512787575&sr=8-4&keywords=tiny+homes](https://www.amazon.com/Allwood-Kit-Cabin-Lillevilla-Escape/dp/B00076AL5W/ref=sr_1_4?ie=UTF8&qid=1512787575&sr=8-4&keywords=tiny+homes)

### **WHAT DO I SUPPORT?**

#### **I support councilman Khamis and Rocha's memo 100%!**

We are having a housing crisis and the cost for 40 units that will benefit just a few is outrageous.

You are also creating a social issue emphasizing the difference for those who live in these pods as different or that they have less value because they need to live in a strange locations and in something that is not a real home.

Just use the current infrastructure and house people as they are like anyone else. Let the county to share responsibility. Those with serious issues need special attention and a BHC in a cloverleaf is not a place for that.

So just **treat people equally** and subsidize units that can be used for rapid rehousing and master lease plan. The goal should be cost effectiveness and more people that will be housed. People can go to services nearby or have a more customized type of services with money saved from not building the pods but using these funds towards services.

I think is **degrading** to try to use strange things to house people instead of just discretely allow them to feel like they used be before becoming homeless and forget they were homeless someday. OR just buy motels and hotels and house tem quickly into regular housing like anybody else and those with issues into the right places to address their problems.

Instead of focusing into innovating in temporary housing, maybe try to shift the focus into developing permanent housing that is cost effective and vertical. Here is a sample of something innovative and futuristic. Future is space saving, cost efficient and blends in.

**THIS IS A FUTURISTIC SAN JOSE. NOT WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED. VERTICAL AND RATIONAL USE OF SPACE.**

<https://www.highsnobiety.com/p/honeycomb-homeless-neighborhoods/>

Regards,

Mila Heally – D2 resident

---

**From:** jerry booth < >

**Sent:** Saturday, December 9, 2017 8:04 AM

**To:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; District1; City Clerk

**Subject:** Bridge Housing Communities

Good morning, Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk:

As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose. We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis. However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, at the earliest. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement once the BHC plan is approved by Council." Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious. Mr. Mayor and Council Members, NOW is the time to take action to address the serious and escalating problem of homelessness in San Jose. We want long-term comprehensive solutions - not trendy Band-Aid solutions that are expensive, time-consuming, and controversial, while providing assistance ONLY to a very few.

Here is what we think should be done:

**1. FIRST AND FOREMOST: ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT CREATE HOMELESSNESS IN THE FIRST PLACE.**

- For those with mental health and addiction issues, create inpatient treatment facilities staffed by doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, social workers, and drug addiction counselors who will work with people to address and treat the issues that led to them to living on the street. Successful completion of these programs must be a requirement for people to transition to permanent housing. Outpatient social workers should continue to counsel them to ensure that they do not return to homelessness.
- For those who do not suffer from addiction or mental illness, provide centers where they can find job training and resources for job searches.
- Prevent homelessness by creating an office that provides grants for people who face eviction due to temporary loss of income.
- 2. Add to the existing housing supply.
- Purchase units in existing manufactured home communities.
- Establish campground-like facilities for those living in their campers or RVs.
- Streamline the regulations for in-law units and promote their implementation.
- Purchase homes in each district to house up to 6 tenants, as suggested by one of the council members several months ago
- Provide affordable board-and-care homes for those who require more care. (Currently, the cost is around \$4000.00 per bed. No wonder so many mentally ill people are on the streets.)
- Require developers to include moderate and low-income units in new housing developments.
- Work with other cities in Santa Clara County to increase moderate and low-income housing supply.
- Negotiate with Silicon Valley companies, such as Apple and Google, to contribute financially to these efforts. Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.  
G.Booth D2

---

**From:** >

**Sent:** Saturday, December 9, 2017 7:59 AM

**To:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; City Clerk

**Subject:** Bridge Housing Communities

Good morning, Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk:

As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose. We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis. However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, at the earliest. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement once the BHC plan is approved by Council." Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious. Mr. Mayor and Council Members, NOW is the time to take action to address the serious and escalating problem of homelessness in San Jose. We want long-term comprehensive solutions - not trendy Band-Aid solutions that are expensive, time-consuming, and controversial, while providing assistance ONLY to a very few.

Here is what we think should be done:

1. FIRST AND FOREMOST: ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT CREATE HOMELESSNESS IN THE FIRST PLACE.

- For those with mental health and addiction issues, create inpatient treatment facilities staffed by doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, social workers, and drug addiction counselors who will work with people to address and treat the issues that led to them to living on the street. Successful completion of these programs must be a requirement for people to transition to permanent housing. Outpatient social workers should continue to counsel them to ensure that they do not return to homelessness.
  - For those who do not suffer from addiction or mental illness, provide centers where they can find job training and resources for job searches.
  - Prevent homelessness by creating an office that provides grants for people who face eviction due to temporary loss of income.
2. Add to the existing housing supply.
- Purchase units in existing manufactured home communities.
  - Establish campground-like facilities for those living in their campers or RVs.
  - Streamline the regulations for in-law units and promote their implementation.
  - Purchase homes in each district to house up to 6 tenants, as suggested by one of the council members several months ago
  - Provide affordable board-and-care homes for those who require more care. (Currently, the cost is around \$4000.00 per bed. No wonder so many mentally ill people are on the streets.)
  - Require developers to include moderate and low-income units in new housing developments.
  - Work with other cities in Santa Clara County to increase moderate and low-income housing supply.
  - Negotiate with Silicon Valley companies, such as Apple and Google, to contribute financially to these efforts. Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.

P.Edgerton D2

---

**From:** Mary Anne Devine < >

**Sent:** Saturday, December 9, 2017 7:54 AM

**To:** mayoremail@sanjosecity.gov; district1@sanjosecity.gov; district2@sanjosecity.gov; district3@sanjosecity.gov; district4@sanjosecity.gov; district5@sanjosecity.gov; district6@sanjosecity.gov; district7@sanjosecity.gov; district8@sanjosecity.gov; district8@sanjosecity.gov; district9@sanjosecity.gov; district10@sanjosecity.gov; City Clerk  
**Subject:** Vote on Bridge Housing 12/12/2017

Good morning, Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk:

As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose.

We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis. However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, *at the earliest*. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement **once the BHC plan is approved by Council.**" Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious.

Mr. Mayor and Council Members, NOW is the time to take action to address the serious and escalating problem of homelessness in San Jose. We want long-term comprehensive solutions - not trendy Band-Aid solutions that are expensive, time-consuming, and controversial, while providing assistance ONLY to a very few.

Here is what we think should be done:

**1. FIRST AND FOREMOST: ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT CREATE HOMELESSNESS IN THE FIRST PLACE.**

- **For those with mental health and addiction issues, create inpatient treatment facilities staffed by doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, social workers, and drug addiction counselors who will work with people to address and treat the issues that led to them to living on the street. Successful completion of these programs must be a requirement for people to transition to permanent housing. Outpatient social workers should continue to counsel them to ensure that they do not return to homelessness.**
- **For those who do not suffer from addiction or mental illness, provide centers where they can find job training and resources for job searches.**
- **Prevent homelessness by creating an office that provides grants for people who face eviction due to temporary loss of income.**

**2. Add to the existing housing supply.**

- **Purchase units in existing manufactured home communities.**
- **Establish campground-like facilities for those living in their campers or RVs.**



- **Streamline the regulations for in-law units and promote their implementation.**
- **Purchase homes in each district to house up to 6 tenants, as suggested by one of the council members several months ago.**
- **Provide affordable board-and-care homes for those who require more care. (Currently, the cost is around \$4000.00 per bed. No wonder so many mentally ill people are on the streets.)**
- **Require developers to include moderate and low-income units in new housing developments.**
- **Work with other cities in Santa Clara County to increase moderate and low-income housing supply.**
- **Negotiate with Silicon Valley companies, such as Apple and Google, to contribute financially to these efforts.**

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Mary Anne Devine

[www.sanjoseaction.com](http://www.sanjoseaction.com)

---

**From:** Evie Darwood < >

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 8:53 AM

**To:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; City Clerk

**Subject:** Bridge Housing Communities

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Council Members, and City Clerk,

As a supporter of the grassroots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal.

I do not want Bridge Housing Communities, aka Tiny Homes, in residential neighborhoods for the following reasons:

- Threatens safety of our children and the elderly
- BHC does not address the underlying root causes of homelessness: drug addiction, lack of adequate mental health services to help get the homeless off the streets, lack of adequate supply of low income housing
  
- Increased neighborhood crime
- Neighborhood blight
- Poor sanitation
- Threatens safety and health (eg. Hepatitis A epidemic among homeless)
- Property values will be dramatically lowered in neighborhoods with a Tiny Homes community near
- Draw or magnet for more homeless to come into our area
- Lack of vetting/screening of occupants for criminal backgrounds/no requirement of mental health screening
- Circumvention of longstanding building codes and environmental reviews
- Importing homelessness to Districts 2 and 10
- Negative effect upon businesses
- BHC program, though called temporary, could be extended indefinitely

Mayor Liccardo and City Council Members, our city is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their once beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Sincerely,  
Evelyn Darwood  
Park Sharon Drive  
San Jose, CA 95136

---

**From:** Appurv Jain <

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 8:57 AM

**To:** District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; City Clerk

**Subject:** Regarding the Tiny Homes/Bridge Housing Issue

Good morning,

Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk:

As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose.

We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis. However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, at the earliest. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement once the BHC plan is approved by Council." Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious.

Mr. Mayor and Council Members, NOW is the time to take action to address the serious and escalating problem of homelessness in San Jose. We want long-term comprehensive solutions - not trendy Band-Aid solutions that are expensive, time-consuming, and controversial, while providing assistance ONLY to a very few.

Here is what we think should be done:

1. First And Foremost: ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT CREATE HOMELESSNESS IN THE FIRST PLACE.

- For those with mental health and addiction issues, create inpatient treatment facilities staffed by doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, social workers, and drug addiction counselors who will work with people to address and treat the issues that led to them to living on the street. Successful completion of these programs must be a requirement for people to transition to permanent housing. Outpatient social workers should continue to counsel them to ensure that they do not return to homelessness.
- For those who do not suffer from addiction or mental illness, provide centers where they can find job training and resources for job searches.
- Prevent homelessness by creating an office that provides grants for people who face eviction due to temporary loss of income.

2. Add to the existing housing supply.

- Purchase units in existing manufactured home communities.
- Establish campground-like facilities for those living in their campers or RVs.
- Streamline the regulations for in-law units and promote their implementation.
- Purchase homes in each district to house up to 6 tenants, as suggested by one of the council members several months ago.
- Provide affordable board-and-care homes for those who require more care. (Currently, the cost is around \$4000.00 per bed. No wonder so many mentally ill people are on the streets.)
- Require developers to include moderate and low-income units in new housing developments.
- Work with other cities in Santa Clara County to increase moderate and low-income housing supply.
- Negotiate with Silicon Valley companies, such as Apple and Google, to contribute financially to these efforts.

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Appurv Jain  
Station 121 Community  
South San Jose

---

**From:** Catherine Dilts < >

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 4:07 PM

**To:** Liccardo, Sam; Henninger, Ragan; Jimenez, Sergio; Chapman, Helen; Davis, Dev; Garavaglia, Christina; Nguyen, Tam; Moua, Louansee; Arenas, Sylvia; McGarrity, Patrick; Carrasco, Magdalena; Castro, Huascar; Khamis, Johnny; Fedor, Denelle; Connolly, Shane Patrick; Jones, Chappie; Ferguson, Jerad; Pressman, Christina; Diep, Lan; Lebron, Charisse; Rocha, Donald; Joanino, Jacklyn; raul.peralez@sanjose.ca.gov; Ramos, Christina M; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; Lopez, Robert (HSG); District7; District8; District9; Sykes, Dave; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky; District 10; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; City Clerk

**Subject:** Bridge Housing

December 11, 2017

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Council Members, and City Clerk,

As a supporter of the grassroots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal.

I do not want Bridge Housing Communities, aka Tiny Homes, in residential neighborhoods for the following reasons:

- Threatens safety of our children and the elderly
- BHC does not address the underlying root causes of homelessness: drug addiction, lack of adequate mental health services to help get the homeless off the streets, lack of adequate supply of low income housing
- Increased neighborhood crime
- Neighborhood blight
- Poor sanitation
- Threatens safety and health (eg. Hepatitis A epidemic among homeless)
- Property values will be dramatically lowered in neighborhoods with a Tiny Homes community near
- Draw or magnet for more homeless to come into our area
- Lack of vetting/screening of occupants for criminal backgrounds/no requirement of mental health screening
- Circumvention of longstanding building codes and environmental reviews
- Importing homelessness to Districts 2 and 10
- Negative effect upon businesses
- BHC program, though called temporary, could be extended indefinitely

Mayor Liccardo and City Council Members, our city is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their once beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Sincerely,

Catherine Dilts  
Park Sharon Drive,  
San Jose, CA 95136

---

**From:** Bobbi Yodz < >

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 4:03 PM

**To:** Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10

**Cc:** Bramson, Ray; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky

**Subject:** Bridge Housing

Letter to the Mayor, City Council and City Clerk Regarding the Tiny Homes/Bridge Housing Issue:

Good morning, Honorable Mayor Liccardo, Council Members and City Clerk: As a supporter of the grass roots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal. This proposal will be heard on December 12, 2017. We object to the concept of Bridge Housing Communities because it is inefficient, costly, unpopular with residents, and does not address the underlying problems of homelessness in San Jose. We are fully aware that BHC is a temporary housing solution to be used on an emergency basis. However, due to the timeline of the Housing Department, it seems unlikely that anyone will benefit from this program until late 2018, at the earliest. As stated on Page 2 of the December 1, 2017 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council, "Based on the projected timeline, a BHC will take approximately 12 months to develop and fully implement once the BHC plan is approved by Council." Other proposals considered, such as Safe Parking and Rapid Rehousing, are more cost-effective and expeditious.

Mr. Mayor and Council Members, NOW is the time to take action to address the serious and escalating problem of homelessness in San Jose. We want long-term comprehensive solutions - not trendy Band-Aid solutions that are expensive, time-consuming, and controversial, while providing assistance ONLY to a very few.

Here is what we think should be done:

**1. FIRST AND FOREMOST: ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT CREATE HOMELESSNESS IN THE FIRST PLACE.**

- For those with mental health and addiction issues, create inpatient treatment facilities staffed by doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, social workers, and drug addiction counselors who will work with people to address and treat the issues that led to them to living on the street. Successful completion of these programs must be a requirement for people to transition to permanent housing. Outpatient social workers should continue to counsel them to ensure that they do not return to homelessness.
- For those who do not suffer from addiction or mental illness, provide centers where they can find job training and resources for job searches.
- Prevent homelessness by creating an office that provides grants for people who face eviction due to temporary loss of income.

2. Add to the existing housing supply.

- Purchase units in existing manufactured home communities.
- Establish campground-like facilities for those living in their campers or RVs.
- Streamline the regulations for in-law units and promote their implementation.
- Purchase homes in each district to house up to 6 tenants, as suggested by one of the council members several months ago.
- Provide affordable board-and-care homes for those who require more care. (Currently, the cost is around \$4000.00 per bed. No wonder so many mentally ill people are on the streets.)
- Require developers to include moderate and low-income units in new housing developments.
- Work with other cities in Santa Clara County to increase moderate and low-income housing supply.
- Negotiate with Silicon Valley companies, such as Apple and Google, to contribute financially to these efforts.

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members, our City is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bobbi Yodz,  
in agreement with

[www.sanjoseaction.com](http://www.sanjoseaction.com)



---

**From:** Catherine Dilts < >

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 3:49 PM

**To:** Liccardo, Sam; Henninger, Ragan; Jimenez, Sergio; Chapman, Helen; Davis, Dev; Garavaglia, Christina; Nguyen, Tam; Moua, Louansee; Arenas, Sylvia; McGarrity, Patrick; Carrasco, Magdalena; Castro, Huascar; Khamis, Johnny; Fedor, Denelle; Connolly, Shane Patrick; Jones, Chappie; Ferguson, Jerad; Pressman, Christina; Diep, Lan; Lebron, Charisse; Rocha, Donald; Joanino, Jacklyn; raul.peralez@sanjose.ca.gov; Ramos, Christina M; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; Lopez, Robert (HSG); District7; District8; District9; Sykes, Dave; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky; District 10; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; City Clerk

**Subject:** Bridge Housing

December 11, 2017

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Council Members, and City Clerk,

As a supporter of the grassroots organization of neighbors and business owners, San Jose ACTION, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Tiny Homes (BHC) proposal.

I do not want Bridge Housing Communities, aka Tiny Homes, in residential neighborhoods for the following reasons:

- Threatens safety of our children and the elderly
- BHC does not address the underlying root causes of homelessness: drug addiction, lack of adequate mental health services to help get the homeless off the streets, lack of adequate supply of low income housing
- Increased neighborhood crime
- Neighborhood blight
- Poor sanitation
- Threatens safety and health (eg. Hepatitis A epidemic among homeless)
- Property values will be dramatically lowered in neighborhoods with a Tiny Homes community near
- Draw or magnet for more homeless to come into our area
- Lack of vetting/screening of occupants for criminal backgrounds/no requirement of mental health screening
- Circumvention of longstanding building codes and environmental reviews
- Importing homelessness to Districts 2 and 10
- Negative effect upon businesses
- BHC program, though called temporary, could be extended indefinitely

Mayor Liccardo and City Council Members, our city is in crisis. Residents are concerned about increased crime and blight. People don't feel safe in their neighborhoods and wonder what has happened to their once beautiful city. Please work with us to create feasible solutions that benefit ALL the citizens of San Jose.

Sincerely,

Catherine Dilts  
Park Sharon Drive,  
San Jose, CA 95136

---

**From:** Elvera Faria <e >  
**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 3:10 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** RE: BRIDGE HOUSING - Public Comment to be added to agenda for Dec 12th

I would like this email string attached to tomorrow's memo for Bridge Housing. Regardless if Chris Block is currently Executive Director of Charities Housing or not he was in the past, he is biased and there is clearly a conflict of interest. He has been to many meetings in Dist 2 trying to sell us on the Charities Housing project, and I don't feel he will be a fair facilitator for the constituents of any district due to this bias.

Thank you!  
Elvera

**From:** Elvera Faria  
**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 2:06 PM  
**To:** 'Morales-Ferrand, Jacky' <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Cc:** 'cityclerk@sanjoseca.gov' <cityclerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: BRIDGE HOUSING - Public Comment to be added to agenda for Dec 12th

So then there is still a conflict of interest as he is facilitating on a highly controversial project for Charities Housing in our area as well. So now we are paying him to sell us on the idea of Bridge Housing?

Elvera Faria

**From:** Morales-Ferrand, Jacky [<mailto:Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 1:58 PM  
**To:** Elvera Faria < >  
**Subject:** RE: BRIDGE HOUSING - Public Comment to be added to agenda for Dec 12th

Hi Elvera,

Chris Block **is not** the current executive director of Charities Housing. He is the PAST director but is working as a facilitator for them. Dan Wu is the executive director of Charities Housing. Please see the attached link. He is also not doing it for free. We will be executing a contract for under \$10,000.

<http://charitieshousing.org/about-us/management-profiles/>

Jacky Morales-Ferrand

Director

City of San José Department of Housing

[Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov) | [www.sjhousing.org](http://www.sjhousing.org)

408.535.3855

*Our mission is to strengthen and revitalize our community through housing and neighborhood investment.*

**From:** Elvera Faria [<mailto:> ]

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 12:27 PM

**To:** Liccardo, Sam <[sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov)>; Henninger, Ragan <[ragan.henninger@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:ragan.henninger@sanjoseca.gov)>; Jimenez, Sergio <[sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov)>; Chapman, Helen <[helen.chapman@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:helen.chapman@sanjoseca.gov)>; Davis, Dev <[dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov)>; Garavaglia, Christina <[Christina.Garavaglia@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Christina.Garavaglia@sanjoseca.gov)>; Nguyen, Tam <[Tam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Tam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov)>; Moua, Louansee <[Louansee.Moua@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Louansee.Moua@sanjoseca.gov)>; Arenas, Sylvia <[sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov)>; McGarrity, Patrick <[Patrick.McGarrity@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Patrick.McGarrity@sanjoseca.gov)>; Carrasco, Magdalena <[Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov)>; Castro, Huascar <[huascar.castro@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:huascar.castro@sanjoseca.gov)>; Khamis, Johnny <[johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov)>; Fedor, Denelle <[Denelle.Fedor@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Denelle.Fedor@sanjoseca.gov)>; Connolly, Shane Patrick <[shane.connolly@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:shane.connolly@sanjoseca.gov)>; Jones, Chappie <[Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov)>; Ferguson, Jerad <[Jerad.Ferguson@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jerad.Ferguson@sanjoseca.gov)>; Pressman, Christina <[Christina.Pressman@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Christina.Pressman@sanjoseca.gov)>; Diep, Lan <[lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov)>; Lebron, Charisse <[charisse.lebron@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:charisse.lebron@sanjoseca.gov)>; Rocha, Donald <[Donald.Rocha@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Donald.Rocha@sanjoseca.gov)>; Joanino, Jacklyn <[Jacklyn.Joanino@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jacklyn.Joanino@sanjoseca.gov)>; [raul.peralez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:raul.peralez@sanjoseca.gov); Ramos, Christina M <[christina.m.ramos@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:christina.m.ramos@sanjoseca.gov)>; District1 <[district1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:district1@sanjoseca.gov)>; District2 <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>; District3 <[district3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:district3@sanjoseca.gov)>; District4 <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>; District5 <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>; District 6 <[district6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:district6@sanjoseca.gov)>; Lopez, Robert (HSG) <[Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov)>; District7 <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>; District8 <[district8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:district8@sanjoseca.gov)>; District9 <[district9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:district9@sanjoseca.gov)>; Sykes, Dave <[Dave.Sykes@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Dave.Sykes@sanjoseca.gov)>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <[Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov)>; District 10 <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <[TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov)>; City Clerk <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>

**Subject:** BRIDGE HOUSING - Public Comment to be added to agenda for Dec 12th

This letter is to inform you that I am opposed to the attached Supplemental Memorandum out by Jacky Morales and her selection of Chris Block for professional facilitation for Bridge Housing. Chris Block is currently executive director of Charities Housing. Charities Housing is attempting to put in one of their low-income/chronically homeless facilities at 397 Blossom Hill RD, despite prior opposition from the Community. Ash Kalra re-zoned it when he was in office to stop this. Our area is supposed to get an urban village in this area. With that being said this is

a major conflict of interest and I do not think your transparency committee would approve of him being the facilitator. Is this something he is doing for free in order to get his permits approved for 397 Blossom Hill Rd?

You can see that Charities already has Blossom Hill Rd on their website as a future development despite the fact the CUP hasn't been approved yet.

<http://charitieshousing.org/our-communities/in-the-pipeline/>

Sincerely,  
Elvera Faria  
Dist 2 Resident

---

**From:** Bobbi Yodz <

**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 3:35 PM

**To:** sam.iccardo@sanjoseca.gov; Henninger, Ragan; Jimenez, Sergio; Chapman, Helen

**Cc:** Davis, Dev; Garavaglia, Christina; Nguyen, Tam; Moua, Louansee; sylvia.arena@sanjoseca.gov;

McGarrity, Patrick; Carrasco, Magdalena; Castro, Huascar; Khamis, Johnny;

denele.fedor@sanjoseca.gov; Connolly, Shane Patrick; Jones, Chappie; Ferguson, Jerad; Pressman,

Christina; Diep, Lan; Lebron, Charisse; Rocha, Donald; Joanino, Jacklyn; Peralez, Raul; Ramos, Christina

M; Sykes, Dave; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky; City Clerk

**Subject:** Bridge Housing

Just when you think you have seen and heard it all, Ms. Morales has hit a new low for the City - it seems as though she is trying to pull a fast one on the residents of San Jose and in particular, those of us in District 2.

Quoting below from a neighbor:

"This letter is to inform you that I am opposed to the Supplemental Memorandum out by Jacky Morales and her selection of Chris Block for professional facilitation for Bridge Housing. Chris Block is currently executive director of Charities Housing. Charities Housing is attempting to put in one of their low-income/chronically homeless facilities at 397 Blossom Hill RD, despite prior opposition from the Community. Ash Kalra re-zoned it when he was in office to stop this. Our area is supposed to get an urban village in this area. With that being said this is a major conflict of interest and I do not think your transparency committee would approve of him being the facilitator. Is this something he is doing for free in order to get his permits approved for 397 Blossom Hill Rd?"

Who in their ethical mind would think this is appropriate to even consider? I certainly hope to see & hear this idea shot down immediately at the Council Meeting on December 12th. It is proposals such as this one that makes residents believe our intelligence is severely underestimated and that we can be easily duped. Along with the "deep understanding" that Mr. Block has with this issue, he is currently working with a proposal that is stirring up a great deal of controversy in District 2.

I have been to a meeting in which Mr. Block participated. His position for the ACO project was stated in no uncertain terms. Why would someone with a previously stated interest in the matter of housing the homeless, being the Founder of Charities Housing Developers, be the best candidate that Morales could propose as a facilitator? Wouldn't his participation at least bring up the question of neutrality, a neutral position being what I would hope a facilitator would have? I am not disparaging the man as a professional; however, this role would place him right in the middle of a controversial and emotional topic in our community regarding and issue in which he has

vested interests. Do you want to bring any question into the proceedings as they move forward?

I am assuming he said he would do this on a pro bono basis as is desired.sam That was not mentioned in the Memorandum.

Do you realize the public outcry which is likely to result if Mr. Block is approved as facilitator? Please do the right thing and dismiss this proposal for lack of transparency.

Bobbi Yodz  
District 2