



Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council

FROM: Toni J. Taber, CMC
City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
March 2-8, 2018

DATE: March 9, 2018

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Letters from the Public

1. Notification from AT&T to the California Public Utilities Commission, dated February 22, 2018, entitled "AT&T Mobility Site – 10093971 – CCL00706 / CCL03423 – SNFCCA0706 – 171 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California 95110."
2. Notification from AT&T to the California Public Utilities Commission, dated March 1, 2018, entitled "AT&T Mobility Site – 1010796 – CCL02052 – Zanker Rd & Hwy 237 – 3990 Zanker Road, San Jose, California 95134."
3. Letters from the Public dated March 2, 2018 – March 7, 2018 to Mayor and Council against Bridge Housing Communities (BHC) in District 3 at VTA Construction Staging Area near Berryessa BART Station.
4. Letters from Blair Beekman dated March 5, 2018 – March 7, 2018 to Mayor and Council regarding future policies in the City of San Jose.
5. Letters from the Public dated March 3, 2018 – March 5, 2018 regarding the "Source of Income" Ordinance.
6. Letter from Hans Sitte, dated March 7, 2018, entitled "SJWC rates."
7. Letter from Kathy Haren, dated March 8, 2018, regarding San Jose Water Co.'s general rate case.
8. Letter from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, dated March 8, 2018, regarding the Draft Countywide Bicycle Plan Update.

Toni J. Taber, CMC
City Clerk



AT&T
2600 Camino Ramon
4W850L
San Ramon, CA 94583

2/22/2018

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Anna Hom
CONSUMER PROTECTION & SAFETY DIVISION
California Public Utilities Commission

San Francisco, CA 94102

**RE: AT&T Mobility Site - 10093971 – CCL00706 / CCL03423 – SNFCCA0706 – 171
WEST HEDDING STREET, SAN JOSE, California 95110**

This is to provide the Commission with notice to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") that:

(a) AT&T Mobility has obtained all site land use approval(s) for the modification of the project listed above described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local governmental agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any information contained herein, please contact me at

Sincerely,

Attachment

cc: City Planning Director
City Clerk
City Manager
City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St., San Jose, California 95113



ATTACHMENT A

- 1-9 Project Location:** Modification
- Site Identification Number: CCL00706 / CCL03423
- Project Number: 3701A0BACP
- Site Name: SNFCCA0706
- Site Address: 171 WEST HEDDING STREET, SAN JOSE, California
95110
- County: SANTA CLARA
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 230-37-034
- Latitude: 37-21-07.1
- Longitude: 121-54-26.1
-
- 10-14 Project Description:**
- Number of Antennae to be installed: 6 antennas total approved at
67 in height
- Tower Design: BUILDING
- Tower Appearance: BUILDING
-
- Tower Height:
- A) Structure Height 65
- B) Top of antenna Height 67
-
- Building Size(s): N/A
-
- 15 Business addresses of all Governmental Agencies (from permit)**
- City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St., San Jose, California 95113
(408) 535-3555
-
- 16 Land Use Approval:** Remove sox antemmas amd replace them with six new antennas in an existing screen.
-
- 17 If Land Use approval was *not* required:** N/A



AT&T
2600 Camino Ramon
4W850L
San Ramon, CA 94583

3/1/2018

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Anna Hom
CONSUMER PROTECTION & SAFETY DIVISION
California Public Utilities Commission

San Francisco, CA 94102

**RE: AT&T Mobility Site - 10101796 – CCL02052 – Zanker Rd & Hwy 237 – 3990
ZANKER ROAD, SAN JOSE, California 95134**

This is to provide the Commission with notice to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") that:

(a) AT&T Mobility has obtained all site land use approval(s) for the modification of the project listed above described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local governmental agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any information contained herein, please contact me at

Sincerely,

Attachment

cc: City Planning Director
City Clerk
City Manager
City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St., San Jose, California 95113



ATTACHMENT A

- 1-9 Project Location:** Modification
- Site Identification Number: CCL02052
- Project Number: 3701882932
- Site Name: Zanker Rd & Hwy 237
- Site Address: 3990 ZANKER ROAD, SAN JOSE, California 95134
- County: SANTA CLARA
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 097-04-037 & 097-04-020
- Latitude: 37-25-11.4
- Longitude: 121-56-00.1
-
- 10-14 Project Description:**
- Number of Antennae to be installed: 9 antennas total approved at
63' in height
- Tower Design: MONOPOLE
- Tower Appearance: MONOPOLE
-
- Tower Height:
- A) Structure Height 77
- B) Top of antenna Height 63'
- Building Size(s): N/A
-
-
- 15 Business addresses of all Governmental Agencies (from permit)**
- City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St., San Jose, California 95113
(408) 535-3555
-
- 16 Land Use Approval:** Modification to an existing AT&T cell site.
-
- 17 If Land Use approval was *not* required:** N/A

From: Katarzyna Rogawska

Sent: Friday, March 2, 2018 11:56 AM

To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; distict8@sanjoseca.gov; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Residents' Voices on Charities Housing

Dear City Representatives,

I am a resident of the Del Roble neighborhood in District 10 (on the border with District 2). I have recently been informed that Charities Housing wants to develop the ACO Furniture site at 397 Blossom Hill Road. Charities Housing is planning a 160 unit low income housing project for this site.

I want to express my opposition to the idea and my and my neighbors' concern that this project will adversely affect our neighborhood.

This same proposal was made three years ago. At that time, neighbors and Councilman Ash Kalra worked together to engage the community to fight the proposal. Their efforts were successful and the plan was withdrawn. The proposal was a bad idea three years ago and it is a bad idea now. There is no benefit to the surrounding neighborhoods from this proposal and there is a potential for increased crime and blight.

The ACO Charities Housing project is not in conformance with any of the suggestions from the summaries of the meetings. This development is out of scale for the neighborhood and does not fit with the Urban Village concept discussed by neighbors two years ago. Many residents attended meetings to discuss the concept of an Urban Village Plan for the Blossom Hill/Snell area. As the City Representatives listened, neighbors supported mixed use residential areas, revitalized retail and commercial areas and open spaces and parks. I believe local Residents' voices cannot be ignored and the plans discussed with them changed without their approval.

We purchased our home and moved into this residential neighborhood hoping to be a part of an established community. Now we are facing the possibility of the neighborhood deteriorating even more. There are plans of closing Del Roble Elementary School, and where there were plans/promises of building an urban village with a neighborhood park serving local families (ACO furniture lit), now there are plans of the housing project, while the Urban Village project is currently stalled. We would gladly welcome developments aimed at serving local families by providing safe family-friendly spaces and employment opportunities, but are against the current plans.

I am sure you are aware that our area is already a red spot on the city's map when it comes to homeless encampments and crime. It can be easily verified by the number of 911 calls and police activity in the neighborhood. We as residents are concerned that this project will adversely affect the neighborhood and decrease safety in our area even further.

I am writing for you to hear my voice against this development. I do trust our elected City Officials will take into consideration the opinions of Residents when considering further developmet plans for this site.

Best regards,
Kasia Rogawska

From: Hui Chen

Sent: Sunday, March 4, 2018 8:35 PM

To: Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; BridgeHousingCommunities; District3; Pham, Kieulan; Customer Service

Subject: Against BHC in District 3

Dear Officer,

I am Isabel, a future home owner of Apex @ Berryessa Crossing.

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) Tax payers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the tax payers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than tax payers. Tax payers has the rights to vote for other usage of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(2) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping really helpful to homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restroom and kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters is just a temporary trade off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(3) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not tax payer oriented.

(4) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(5) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in north San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded with high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Hope you can hear and consider my voice. Thanks.

Your Sincerely,
Isabel

From: Hui Chen

Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 8:42 PM

To: Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; BridgeHousingCommunities; Rork, Christopher; Duenas, Norberto; District3; Pham, Kieulan; Customer Service

Subject: Against BHC in District 3

Dear Officer,

I am Hui Chen, a home owner of Apex @ Berryessa Crossing.

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) Tax payers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the tax payers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than tax payers. Tax payers has the rights to vote for other usage of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(2) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping really helpful to homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restroom and kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters is just a temporary trade off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(3) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not tax payer oriented.

(4) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(5) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in north San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded with high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Hope you can hear and consider my voice. Thanks.

Your Sincerely,
Hui

From: Miranda Qian
Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 12:03 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Against BHC in district 3

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jose BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) As Berryessa Bart station will open soon, it will bring more and more people and vehicle traffic. Building a homeless shelter will make the traffic worse.

(2) There are two big new communities (KB and Pulte) building in the Berryessa area, it will bring almost 600-700 new households in this area. Building a shelter around D3 district will threaten the safety of the large amount of residents.

(3) Taxpayers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the taxpayers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than taxpayers. Taxpayers have the rights to vote for another use of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(4) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping helpful to really help homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restrooms kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters are just a temporary trade-off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(5) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During the meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not taxpayer oriented.

(6) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If the city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(7) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in North San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded by high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Your Sincerely,

From: Yi Wang

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 9:52 AM

To: District3; BridgeHousingCommunities; Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; Rork, Christopher; Duenas, Norberto; Pham, Kieulan

Subject: Against BHC near the Berryessa Bart Station

Dear Officers,

My family has lived in Berryessa area for more than 7 years and my daughter was born here. My house is near the future Berryessa Bart station and flea market. My family and I are strongly against constituting the BHC program near the Berryessa Bart Station and Flea Market. This site is too close to residential area and it is about half a mile to my house. I am worried about the safety and security problems especially for little kids. More than half of homeless people have drug issues and mental health issues. I do not want my daughter to grow up in such a dangerous neighborhood, which has drug issues and mental illnesses. My family will be afraid of walking outside of our house once the homeless people gathered around the BHC program.

According to News reports, the flea market will be developed to an high-density residential and business area. Then, the BHC site1 is just across the street to this future high density business and residential area, which will be too close to residential area.

Finally but not the least, I really do not think just providing some temporary housing will help homeless people to start a new life. Government should use the money of building BHC to help homeless people quit drug additions, treat their mental illness, and train them for proper work positions. So, I am strongly against the BHC program.

Best,
Yi Wang

From: Ying Liu

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 12:34 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@sanjoeca.gov; District8; District9; District10@sanjose.gov; Pham, Kieulan; ; Customer Service; Ibanez, Angel

Subject: Re: See what you will bring with your BHC proposals on VTA construction District 3!!!! Please be responsible for residents here!

Dear Major representative:

We are humanitarian to your humanitarian crisis, but any kind of humanity should be limited. We already paid heavy tax to the federal, to the state to settle them down, but the bottom line here is that we should at least guarantee to live safe. How a person with a government's idea that pay money to buy risks around us? This proposal brings the nowadays, and the future fears and risks to the City of San Jose. It evicates kind, honest and hard working residents from this city, because no one hopes to give humanitarian at risks of endangering in safety issues.

Humanity should have its bottom line, you shouldn't sacrifice the development of a city which just reachieved is living power from coming large group of populations and coming high-tech companies. You induce thousands of homeless shelters this year, then thousands of thousands of homeless will coming in the next years. Then you are evicting residents when doing this, and just evict more and more. The final state of this city will be a group of homeless because the homeless love to move here and the hard working people have to choose leave here when they feel danger. What's the benefit of doing this to San Jose as city councils? Why richer area, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Palo Alto, Mountain View all object this? Because they are richer and born to live in safety?

So please again, residential area should be treated fairly no matter whether it's rich or poor. They are all lives, and should be guarantee their safeties. The district 3 (rank #1) introduce thounds of new residents last year, and already have large group of original residents. It's the area they live at night. Due to the current police abilities in San Jose, what courage do you have to protect this area from increasing risks of dangers? The answer is clearly no. Then please do not introduce more risks here and keep them safe!

On Mon, Mar 5, 2018 at 11:48 AM, Ibanez, Angel <Angel.Ibanez@sanjoeca.gov> wrote:

Dear Ying,

Thank you for your email. We understand that you have concerns about the potential bridge housing community in your District. I appreciate you taking the time to share your concerns with the Mayor and City Council.

Mayor Liccardo believes we must pursue a variety of options for homeless housing — including bridge housing communities — particularly given the significant challenges we face in rapidly housing homeless

individuals. We have a housing and shelter shortage and permanent housing projects take many years to develop.

The Mayor recognizes that many of our residents have concerns about how homeless housing could impact the surrounding community because of fears about having homeless people in their communities. But thousands of homeless residents already live in our community and in our neighborhoods. Living outside subjects each of those individuals — and the entire community — to an extraordinary risk of harm. The simple fact is that homes end homelessness. We can make our neighborhoods far safer, cleaner, and more livable if these same individuals have secure housing, with on-site managers, security, and access to important social services. Homeless people who have access to and take advantage of resources show fast progress, moving back into the community. The current bridge housing proposal is a small, well-designed plan for non-chronically homeless individuals.

In addition, the City is working on other solutions. Until we all treat this crisis with the urgency it needs by supporting building housing units across Council districts — and not just in poorer areas — we won't alleviate the crisis. With thousands of homeless residents already living in our neighborhoods, we believe we'll all be safer if we get them off the streets and into housing, and bridge housing is one of the promising and dignified ways to rapidly do so.

Homelessness is a humanitarian crisis in our community, and because every person on the streets is deserving of our compassion and help, we are continuing the complex and difficult conversation that our community must have about how and where we house these neediest residents in the City of San José.

I have added links to additional information about the bridge housing proposed for your information.

<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/74928>

<http://files.constantcontact.com/7a210436601/d84e84b5-70ed-46b4-90dd-3b8e4d6b7cce.pdf>

Thank you again for your email.

On behalf of Mayor Sam Liccardo,

Angel

From: Ying Liu

Sent: Thursday, March 1, 2018 3:32 PM

To: Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; BridgeHousingCommunities <BridgeHousingCommunities@sanjoseca.gov>; Rork, Christopher <christopher.rork@sanjoseca.gov>; Duenas, Norberto <Norberto.Duenas@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; Pham, Kieulan <kieulan.pham@sanjoseca.gov>; ; Customer Service <customerservice@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: See what you will bring with your BHC proposals on VTA construction District 3!!!! Please be responsible for residents here!

To representatives who should be responsible for the safety of the residents of the newly growing large population within working distance of this BHC idea:

Here is what you promised to build this area in 2017, for the 15-year-plan and large populations of young techs moved here with our belief:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K7u_sh1y8iY

And now when 80% of people already moved in or ready moved in, you change your mind to make this area like this:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YSbtFWmZ1Ow>

We afford the crazy price of the bay area and bought a house to live here, **not expect to live with flourishing, but with Safety!!!!**

Now the government is just like a liar together with the KB and ONYX. When their house almost sold out, you announce this ridiculous news, putting this area which previously not in discussion suddenly to the Ranking #1 selection.

You bring a group of people, **90% of them have addiction problems, and 25% once was in crime**, to this new large population of young techs, **when devote themselves to be paid by honest and hard working, and want to live a peaceful life with families.**

Once you start treating so well to people who don't work, then it will never stop!

Yes, most residents near this area are Chinese. They exchange things they want with honest hard working and strictly following the laws, they are polite and humble, but was hurt by you with such a ridiculous proposals instead.

Please stop treating us like this. This is an area just building up and starting to blossom, don't ruin this area, the city, and the people here. And please be responsible for your city plans.

Don't turn a city, which is catching up with Sunnyvale and Mountain View, to a DEBRIS of Danger!!!

Strongly against BHC in District 3! And even this ridiculous proposals! Once you start, it will never stop. Don't ruin San Jose!

From: You Cheng

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 2:29 PM

To: Ibanez, Angel

Cc: Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District1; District 6; District4; District9; Rork, Christopher; District8; Duenas, Norberto; District 10; District3; District5; Pham, Kieulan;

customerservice@sanjose.gov; BridgeHousingCommunities

Subject: Re: You are not saving people but making more into trouble

Hi Angel,

Thank you very much for your reply!

Homeless do exist in the whole community and there are thousands of them here. However, they are spread across the whole community right now. Building a shelter especially a shelter with only 40 spots are only going to attract all them to one place and those who do not have a spot will just camp in that area. Therefore, I strongly disagree doing this in a residence-condense area, especially the area with a lot of public facilities, such as Bart station (District 3) and parks (District).

"We can make our neighborhoods far safer, cleaner, and more livable if these same individuals have secure housing, with on-site managers, security, and access to important social services"
There is one assumption here, which is that site can provide enough space for everyone. But obviously, you cannot! and you can only provide spots up to 40 people. For those who do not get a spot on that site, you cannot make the surrounding area more secure, cleaner or livable. Instead, that area will be **much more less safe and cleaner. While you are not solving the problem, you are creating a new and huge one.**

Regards,
You Cheng

On Mon, Mar 5, 2018 at 11:35 AM, Ibanez, Angel <Angel.Ibanez@sanjoseca.gov> wrote:

Dear You,

Thank you for your email. We understand that you have concerns about the potential bridge housing community in your District. I appreciate you taking the time to share your concerns with the Mayor and City Council.

Mayor Liccardo believes we must pursue a variety of options for homeless housing — including bridge housing communities — particularly given the significant challenges we face in rapidly housing homeless individuals. We have a housing and shelter shortage and permanent housing projects take many years to develop.

The Mayor recognizes that many of our residents have concerns about how homeless housing could impact the surrounding community because of fears about having homeless people in their communities. But thousands of homeless residents already live in our community and in our neighborhoods. Living outside subjects each of those individuals — and the entire community — to an extraordinary risk of harm. The simple fact is that homes end homelessness. We can make our neighborhoods far safer, cleaner, and more livable if these same individuals have secure housing, with on-site managers, security, and access to important social services. Homeless people who have access to

and take advantage of resources show fast progress, moving back into the community. The current bridge housing proposal is a small, well-designed plan for non-chronically homeless individuals.

In addition, the City is working on other solutions. Until we all treat this crisis with the urgency it needs by supporting building housing units across Council districts — and not just in poorer areas — we won't alleviate the crisis. With thousands of homeless residents already living in our neighborhoods, we believe we'll all be safer if we get them off the streets and into housing, and bridge housing is one of the promising and dignified ways to rapidly do so.

Homelessness is a humanitarian crisis in our community, and because every person on the streets is deserving of our compassion and help, we are continuing the complex and difficult conversation that our community must have about how and where we house these neediest residents in the City of San José.

I have added links to additional information about the bridge housing proposed for your information.

<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/74928>

<http://files.constantcontact.com/7a210436601/d84e84b5-70ed-46b4-90dd-3b8e4d6b7cce.pdf>

Thank you again for your email.

On behalf of Mayor Sam Liccardo,

Angel

From: You Cheng

Sent: Thursday, March 1, 2018 9:33 PM

To: BridgeHousingCommunities <BridgeHousingCommunities@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: You are not saving people but making more into trouble

Hi,

My name is You Cheng. My address is San Jose, CA 95131.

I recently heard that city of San Jose is going to build BHC for homeless. I have carefully read your website, including FAQ, Memorandum, public letters, etc. I feel I am not convinced at all. I think they are no doubt poor people but doing this will not help them much at the same time put existing residents into chaos, especially District 3.

1. According to your website (FAQ), you mentioned that there are around 4300 homeless and 74% of them don't have a shelter, which is more than 3000. Therefore, I highly doubt that building 20-40 cabins can help resolve this situation. **NOT AT ALL.** While we spend several millions of dollars just to accommodate at most 40 people for 3 years? One of the proposed methods is to accommodate them into existing community. Let's say each people each month cause \$1000, 3 years is \$1,440,000 for 40 people, which is cheaper than bridge housing. Honestly, When I rent a room in a house, it only causes me \$800. \$1000 can make people live in a very nice community. Although there is a difficulty to find such community to accommodate them all, we can spread them to different communities. We can also save the maintenance cost a lot. Therefore, I really don't understand why you are choosing such an

expensive and hard to maintain way to do this. As a taxpayer, I think I have to right to say No this behavior.

2. You mentioned there will be guardian 24/7. My 1st question here is **how many guardians will be there?** There are more than 3000 homeless need to be accommodated. Even half of them come to this shelter, how can you manage them? 40 of them is inside your community, 2900 + people are outside? They most likely just stay in the adjacent park and Bart station (**District 3**). There is no way you can convince them to leave in that case. Then what? Put them in jail? I don't think so. Therefore, this bridge housing is just going to bring homeless to that area especially there is a public transportation!

3. The flea market in **District 3** has been sold and it will probably be turned into a residence. Therefore, it will be close to the homeless shelter, which is really bad. Since they are so close, it will create tons of potential issues, such as crime.

4. With this many of homeless, how can you keep the environment sanitary? You mentioned there is no evidence to show they will increase the crime rate. But it is common sense that they will make that place dirty. Then, who should pay for this cleaning fee?

5. You mentioned about whoever moves into the shelter needs to provide a plan for future housing. What if they don't keep their promise at the end? Are you going to just kick them out? Then they will just stay near the street, parks or public places again? They are homeless and most of them have no credit or very low credit. How should you check this?

6. Whoever is previously employed will be accommodated first. How long did they have work before? One year, 2 years, 5 years or 10 years? A person who has not worked for 5 years have no difference than who never worked.

7. According to your plan, there will be a permanent residency in the future once have funded. Then, why not choose somewhere has a larger land? In that case, it is easy to build more cabins or other permanent buildings. District 3 is in the center area of San Jose. We all want to be sanitary, beautiful and brightness. I just don't understand what kind of government want to such a place to contains full of homeless and make everyone else pay for it!

Overall, I strongly disagree with building BHC at district 3. I believe we need to re-evaluate this plan and make sure we do the best to both homeless and residence!

Regards,

You Cheng

From: Baozi Meng

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 2:55 PM

Subject: STRONGLY AGAINST BHC IN DISTRICT 3

Dear Officer,

I'm a resident from 95133, and I'm strongly against BHC in district 3 near the new Bart station and against this project in general.

I paid property tax every year and I want my district be clean and well organized and the situation now is already very bad, with homeless around and garbages on the street. Bringing BHC here will make this place a hell to live. And I see no benefit I get from the money I paid. Why do I need to pay for someone that is not actually tax payer or even may not be a resident for San Jose city.

Secondly, this plan is based on an incorrect information. There will be a lot denser residency since more than 3000 new homes will be built in the coming 5 years. There is now data showing that this calculation is based on any future planning of this land. And this BHC location will soon be in the middle of residential neighborhood! If government is not making plans for future, how will its residents vote for it?

Thirdly, this plan does not sounds like a maintainable plan. I'm not convinced that this plan will hold that many homeless people and provide them what they need. They do not have restrooms, kitchen and sufficient supplies. It also raises security concerns when they do not have enough supplies.

Finally, this horrible plan will gather homeless from all over the bay area, increasing the total number of homeless in San Jose, which is the opposite result for the original purpose of this plan. How are you going to control this situation from getting out of control?

Thanks,
April Ding

From: Peter CY Liu

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 3:48 PM

To: Liccardo, Sam

Cc: 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; ; Customer Service

Subject: No!!! to the homeless shelter in District 3

Dear Officer:

I am an obedient immigrant coming to US, Silicon Valley specifically, in the hope of pursuing my American dream. My wife and I work very hard day in and day out and it took us a mountain to get a small condo in the Berryessa Area that we think it would be great, a community that have a very bright future. However, the news that there may be a homeless shelter just <1 mile next to our just brought condo is a devastating news to us. It is not like we are not aware of the overall social well-being but this proposal of BHC in District 3 is just not something sounds right which I will try to explain below. Buy I just want to first start with my personal feeling and situation and to let you know that there a lot more residents, in-coming residents (as there are so many new constructions going on) having a similar hope and situation like mine. I always respect authority like you as it takes a lot of courage and efforts to be the representative of the people and I hope that you can really keep doing it and help us, many brilliant individuals, families working hard for their dreams in District 3 to make our concern and request heard by against the homeless shelter proposal in District 3.

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) Tax payers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the tax payers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than tax payers. Tax payers has the rights to vote for other usage of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(2) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping helpful to really help homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restrooms kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters is just a temporary trade off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(3) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not tax payer oriented.

(4) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(5) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in north San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded with high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Your Sincerely,
Peter

From: Shiman Zhang

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 5:21 PM

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

sam.licardo@sanjoseca.gov; Liccardo, Sam

Subject: Strongly against BHC in district 3!!

Dear Officer:

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) Tax payers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the tax payers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than tax payers. Tax payers has the rights to vote for other usage of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(2) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping helpful to really help homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restrooms kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters is just a temporary trade off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(3) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not tax payer oriented.

(4) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(5) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in north San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded with high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Your Sincerely,

Aria

From: Cong Fang
Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Liccardo, Sam
Subject: No homeless shelter in Berryessa

Dear officer,

The planned BHC project in D3 is totally a mistake! The "tiny homes" will never as neat and clean as what it was described. Our community will be under the threaten of crime and drug. Our children will be subjected intimidation and misconduct. This area will soon become a garbage dump.

- Tax paid by tax payers in this area can only be used to maximize their benefit. The BHC is not!
- The shelter is never a good solution to solve the problem but only exacerbate a worse situation.

Please reject BHC.
Your Sincerely,
Cong

From: Tao Jiang
Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 8:51 PM
To: Liccardo, Sam; Peralez, Raul
Cc: Diep, Lan; City Clerk
Subject: Letter to SJ Mayor Sam L. & D3 Councilman Raul P.

Letter to SJ Mayor Sam & D3 Councilman Raul

Recently, various proposals, plans, and municipal code/regulation changes/amendments targeted for solving the homeless problems in the city have been floating in the neighborhood communities. It not only caused massive confusion among the neighbors but also immediately became a public decry.

Most recent topic is about the zone selection that makes Berryessa BART station to be homeless shelter / community. Neighbors are extremely concerned and some have expressed their angers for the matter itself and how it was handled by the City.

Mayor Sam, you had an ambitious line up of panel presentations in the Feb26th meeting. If you had listened to your constituency you would have realized you did not need to go such effort. Our requests were simple – please explain this specific Bridge Housing plan which is being squeezed into our neighborhoods. Who, what, when, where and why. So much time was wasted with your “overview” presentation and the fake image of a homeless person wearing suit (excuse me ???) and that is exactly why we did not want that approach in meeting. Whether or not you were trying to be deceitful or misleading, I assure you that is the way it came across. Even after the meeting, most of us left with as many questions as had before. Very little new details were given. Many attempts to ask the specific questions were shut down and one resident was even thrown out of the meeting room. As a democratic, you probably agree with us that this kind of behavior is not "democracy". We did not come to this meeting to have our comments merely transcribed with some tiny paper clips, we came to be heard in person by you, face to face. Now that we have lost that cherish-able opportunity to have our voice heard, it leaves us no choice but to send over this letter.

This zone D3 (Berryessa BART station) was selected as a candidate without properly soliciting public feedback and opinions before the decision and vote were made. Moreover, this amendment of homeless shelter construction near residential area was passed even without public voting. There has been very little to no community outreach during this whole process and no information is being shared to the affected communities. Many residents heard about the proposed D3 sites from the Press and not from the City or elected Council representatives. When residents complained to the media about the proposed sites that's when City staff re-evaluated the selection criteria and came up with different guidelines. Unfortunately those guidelines still leave a BHC proposed site D3 right in our backyard.

Arbitrarily turning some lands into homeless shelters may pose great risks to the neighborhoods, and even to the City. Below are just a few of the top concerns and the list could go much longer.

Life and Property Security:

Can you please explain how this D3 site was deemed suitable despite being so close to residences? BART Berryessa Station is too close to the residential and schools, where children/minors assemble and walk by. Having homeless people, with some of them drug users, some alcohol users, some mentally sick, nearby poses catastrophic safety/security risks to the children/minors.

A stone throw away from D3 is the flea market, which is the largest one in California that attracts countless neighbours and their kids, a shelter that contains 700~1000, or even more homeless people that are only 10 steps away will cause much severe life security issues, which we believe neither mayor Sam nor D3 Councilman Raul would want to handle. Falling in the same category is the property security due to burglar or break-in, which downtown SJ is already notorious for, and no one would want that transferred to Berryessa.

Berryessa Homeless Burden:

Yet Berryessa has been dealing with illegal homeless encampments for a while now, along I-680 Highway B4 exit, along the railroad tracks, underneath the overpasses expressway and in the local corner shopping centers. Now the City wants to place a so-called "homeless community tiny homes" in a residential area that is already dealing with its share of homeless issues.

Homeless is San Jose city issue and the whole city (all districts) should take even share of the burden instead of posting it on D3 Berryessa's shoulder. BHC zone selection is about life, about cleanness, about security, about San Jose residents happiness under Mayor Sam's leadership. It is not about which site is yelling louder or protesting harder.

To D3 councilman Raul Peralez (and D4 Lan Diep) specifically BART Berryessa station neighbours are not those should be sacrificed for your political earnings in front of your dear mayor. Mr. Raul Peralez, I understand both you and your mayor's new election campaign in 2018 is flying and you prefer keeping good relationship with Mayor or other councilman. we hope you good luck in your campaign by having this letter published nationwide.

Shelter Maintenance Investment:

Every Berryessa resident who lives close-by BART station agrees that finding appropriate methods to upraise homeless life quality is a necessity for the City, however many questioned the efficacy of the City's plan of BHC at D3. A total of 1.33 acres of land that is fully surrounded by residents and their RVs, schools and factories is what the City Council's recommendation? The unthoughtful selection of location and its tremendous maintenance fees as well as police security fee that City needs to bear afterwards, start to indicate to me that the City has not thought this out in a responsible and realistic way.

Following above, we are already dealing with homeless in our neighborhoods. But to formally send out the overt signal of "Berryessa Welcomes Homeless" is absolutely ridiculous. BART station will even facilitate homeless from other areas to assemble in Berryessa, once homeless finds out this is a great deal for them. How does City plan to deal with such situation that more-than-expectation homeless flock together? What we don't want to see is the shelter becoming a breeding ground for more illegal activities and blight.

Taxpayer's Bill of Rights:

As far as we are concerned, City of San Jose has been subject to financial limitations for a period of time. Homeless shelter, once built, will inevitably vary into a finance black hole. According to Taxpayer's Bill of Rights, we as taxpayers have the right to question, to request City explanation and to devote irresponsible expenditures of our money. Moreover, examples of Los Angeles as well as New York had already taught us lesson of horrible situations that could follow once homeless are officially condensed in one area but then left unattended owing to lack of economic allocations.

Los Angeles

<http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-shelter-q-a-20170929-htm1story.html>

New York

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/29/us/homeless-housing-los-angeles.html>

Environment:

D3 area is right besides a river called Coyote Creek , which as map shows, runs all the way through lots of nearby residents and their outdoor activity areas. Having homeless people nearby poses severe health risks of water and environmental contamination.

Workfare, NOT Welfare:

There is nothing compassionate about sticking someone in an emergency sleeping cabin in a residential neighborhood far from services to address the various underlying causes of homelessness. With deinstitutionalization in the 80s and NO-funding of mental health services, many people were thrown out in the streets. A majority of them need full time intervention, and this involves more than a roof over head.

D3 site is far from existing services. Having shelter near transportation is not the same as having shelter near services. Previous projects in San Jose such as Donner Lofts or Housing First has already been proved as disaster. People are in need of services to address their underlying problems, and without those needed services it becomes a police issue, further straining an already burdened police department.

People with mental illness need full-time health services and close monitoring of medication, so as drug or alcohol additives. People with addiction services need full-time rehabilitation services. People out of work need full-time vocational training and job placement services. Actions to homeless at Tenderloin, SF was a good example of

workfare increase instead of welfare increase, with proper coding training programmes called Code Tenderloin, more than 400 homeless people now work as regular salary man, starting to contribute for community instead of being the sluggish burden. Mr. Westbrook, the director of Code Tenderloin, was a homeless too, quoted from him "Someone from the homeless shelter told me there is such programme, I went immediately, all that in my mind at that moment was that I must leave this shelter and have my own life." Preston Phan, once homeless, is now working for LinkedIn with base pay of \$120K. Neither of them managed to get back to normal life because of a shelter.

BHC is a model which gives no incentive for rising above homelessness and keeps people dependent. It seems Mayor Sam measures success by how long people stay in the free shelter provided for them. We would measure success by people who rise up above homelessness and can stand on their own feet. We need to encourage independence and dignity for those who are capable, and full-time health services for those who are not capable.

In summary, we agree homelessness is biggest problem of San Jose and needs to be addressed, but is it worth bringing this BHC near residential neighborhood, putting our children and neighborhood at risk ? Is it worth risk unlimited financial loss on top of the already-burdened SJ treasury ? Is it worth exchanging homeless issue with crime issue ? Are there other workfare programs like those in San Francisco that could indeed help homeless rise up ? I believe taxpayers would like to see that happening instead of paying for a possible crime breed-land in the backyard.

From: xinrui yu

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 9:03 PM

Subject: strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station!!!

Dear Officer:

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) Tax payers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the tax payers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than tax payers. Tax payers has the rights to vote for other usage of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(2) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping helpful to really help homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restrooms kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters is just a temporary trade off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(3) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not tax payer oriented.

(4) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(5) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in north San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded with high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Your Sincerely,
Xinrui

From: Yan Li

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 9:14 PM

To: Liccardo, Sam; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District 6; District7; District8; District9; District 10; Peralez, Raul; Nguyen, Mindy; BridgeHousingCommunities; City Clerk

Subject: strongly against homeless community on VTA area berryessa

Letter to SJ Mayor Sam & D3 Councilman Raul

Recently, various proposals, plans, and municipal code/regulation changes/ amendments targeted for solving the homeless problems in the city have been floating in the neighborhood communities. It not only caused massive confusion among the neighbors but also immediately became a public decry. Most recent topic is about the zone selection that makes Berryessa BART station to be homeless shelter / community. Neighbors are extremely concerned and some have expressed their angers for the matter itself and how it was handled by the City. Mayor Sam, you had an ambitious line up of panel presentations in the Feb26th meeting. If you had listened to your constituency you would have realized you did not need to go such effort. Our requests were simple – please explain this specific Bridge Housing plan which is being squeezed into our neighborhoods. Who, what, when, where and why. So much time was wasted with your “overview” presentation and the fake image of a homeless person wearing suit (excuse me ???) and that is exactly why we did not want that approach in meeting. Whether or not you were trying to be deceitful or misleading, I assure you that is the way it came across. Even after the meeting, most of us left with as many questions as had before. Very little new details were given. Many attempts to ask the specific questions were shut down and one resident was even thrown out of the meeting room. As a democratic, you probably agree with us that this kind of behavior is not "democracy". We did not come to this meeting to have our comments merely transcribed with some tiny paper clips, we came to be heard in person by you, face to face. Now that we have lost that cherish-able opportunity to have our voice heard, it leaves us no choice but to send over this letter. This zone D3 (Berryessa BART station) was selected as a candidate without properly soliciting public feedback and opinions before the decision and vote were made. Moreover, this amendment of homeless shelter construction near residential area was passed even without public voting. There has been very little to no community outreach during this whole process and no information is being shared to the affected communities. Many residents heard about the proposed D3 sites from the Press and not from the City or elected Council representatives. When residents complained to the media about the proposed sites that's when City staff re-evaluated the selection criteria and came up with different guidelines. Unfortunately those guidelines still leave a BHC proposed site D3 right in our backyard. Arbitrarily turning some lands into homeless shelters may pose great risks to the neighborhoods, and even to the City. Below are just a few of the top concerns and the list could go much longer. Life and Property Security: Can you please explain how this D3 site was deemed suitable despite being so close to residences? BART Berryessa Station is too close to the residentials and schools, where children/minors assemble and walk by. Having homeless people, with some of them drug users, some alcohol users, some mentally sick, nearby poses catastrophic safety/ security risks to the children/minors. A stone throws away from D3 is the flea market, which is the largest one in California that attracts countless neighbours and their kids, a shelter that contains 700~1000, or even more homeless people that are only 10 steps away will cause much severe life security issues, which we believe neither

mayor Sam nor D3 Councilman Raul would want to handle. Falling in the same category is the property security due to burglar or break-in, which downtown SJ is already notorious for, and no one would want that transferred to Berryessa. Berryessa Homeless Burden: Yet Berryessa has been dealing with illegal homeless encampments for a while now, along I-680 Highway B4 exit, along the railroad tracks, underneath the overpasses expressway and in the local corner shopping centers. Now the City wants to place a so-called "homeless community tiny homes" in a residential area that is already dealing with its share of homeless issues. Homeless is San Jose city issue and the whole city (all districts) should take even share of the burden instead of posting it on D3 Berryessa's shoulder. BHC zone selection is about life, about cleanness, about security, about San Jose residents happiness under Mayor Sam's leadership. It is not about which site is yelling louder or protesting harder. To D3 councilman Raul Peralez, specifically BART Berryessa station neighbours are not those should be sacrificed for your political earnings in front of your dear mayor. Mr. Raul Peralez, I understand both you and your mayor's new election campaign in 2018 is flying and you prefer keeping good relationship with Mayor or other councilman. we hope you good luck in your campaign by having this letter published nationwide. Shelter Maintenance Investment: Every Berryessa resident who lives close-by BART station agrees that finding appropriate methods to upraise homeless life quality is a necessity for the City, however many questioned the efficacy of the City's plan of BHC at D3. A total of 1.33 acres of land that is fully surrounded by residents and their RVs, schools and factories is what the City Council's recommendation? The unthoughtful selection of location and its tremendous maintenance fees as well as police security fee that City needs to bear afterwards, start to indicate to me that the City has not thought this out in a responsible and realistic way. Following above, we are already dealing with homeless in our neighborhoods. But to formally send out the overt signal of "Berryessa Welcomes Homeless" is absolutely ridiculous. BART station will even facilitate homeless from other areas to assemble in Berryessa, once homeless finds out this is a great deal for them. How does City plan to deal with such situation that more-than-expectation homeless flock together? What we don't want to see is the shelter becoming a breeding ground for more illegal activities and blight. Taxpayer's Bill of Rights: As far as we are concerned, City of San Jose has been subject to financial limitations for a period of time. Homeless shelter, once built, will inevitably vary into a finance black hole. According to Taxpayer's Bill of Rights, we as taxpayers have the right to question, to request City explanation and to devote irresponsible expenditures of our money. Moreover, examples of Los Angeles as well as New York had already taught us lesson of horrible situations that could follow once homeless are officially condensed in one area but then left unattended owing to lack of economic allocations.

Los Angeles [http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-shelter-q-a-20170929-](http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-shelter-q-a-20170929-htmlstory.html)

[htmlstory.html](http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-shelter-q-a-20170929-htmlstory.html) New York [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/29/us/homeless-housing-los-](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/29/us/homeless-housing-los-angeles.html)

[angeles.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/29/us/homeless-housing-los-angeles.html) Environment: D3 area is right besides a river called Coyote Creek , which as map shows, runs all the way through lots of nearby residents and their outdoor activity areas.

Having homeless people nearby poses severe health risks of water and environmental contamination. Workfare, NOT Welfare: There is nothing compassionate about sticking someone in an emergency sleeping cabin in a residential neighborhood far from services to address the various underlying causes of homelessness. With deinstitutionalization in the 80s and NO-funding of mental health services, many people were thrown out in the streets. A majority of them need full time intervention, and this involves more than a roof over head. D3 site is far from existing services. Having shelter near transportation is not the same as having

shelter near services. Previous projects in San Jose such as Donner Lofts or Housing First has already been proved as disaster. People are in need of services to address their underlying problems, and without those needed services it becomes a police issue, further straining an already burdened police department. People with mental illness need full-time health services and close monitoring of medication, so as drug or alcohol additives. People with addiction services need fulltime rehabilitation services. People out of work need full-time vocational training and job placement services. Actions to homeless at Tenderloin, SF was a good example of workfare increase instead of welfare increase, with proper coding training programmes called Code Tenderloin, more than 400 homeless people now work as regular salary man, starting to contribute for community instead of being the sluggish burden. Mr. Westbrook, the director of Code Tenderloin, was a homeless too, quoted from him "Someone from the homeless shelter told me there is such programme, I went immediately, all that in my mind at that moment was that I must leave this shelter and have my own life." Preston Phan, once homeless, is now working for LinkedIn with base pay of \$120K. Neither of them managed to get back to normal life because of a shelter. BHC is a model which gives no incentive for rising above homelessness and keeps people dependent. It seems Mayor Sam measures success by how long people stay in the free shelter provided for them. We would measure success by people who rise up above homelessness and can stand on their own feet. We need to encourage independence and dignity for those who are capable, and full-time health services for those who are not capable. In summary, we agree homelessness is biggest problem of San Jose and needs to be addressed, but is it worth bringing this BHC near residential neighborhood, putting our children and neighborhood at risk ? Is it worth risk unlimited financial loss on top of the already-burdened SJ treasury ? Is it worth exchanging homeless issue with crime issue ? Are there other workfare programs like those in San Francisco that could indeed help homeless rise up ? I believe taxpayers would like to see that happening instead of paying for a possible crime breed-land in the backyard.

From: LINWEN WANG

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 10:22 PM

To: Liccardo, Sam

Cc: Rork, Christopher; District 10; District2; District3; District5; District 6; District7; District8; Pham, Kieulan; Duenas, Norberto; BridgeHousingCommunities; City Clerk; ;

Customer Service; District1; District4; District9; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo;
sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov

Subject: Against Homeless Shelter in Berryessa

Dear Officer:

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) Tax payers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the tax payers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than tax payers. Tax payers has the rights to vote for other usage of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(2) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping helpful to really help homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restrooms kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters is just a temporary trade off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(3) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not tax payer oriented.

(4) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(5) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in north San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded with high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Your Sincerely

From: Bo Liu

Sent: Wednesday, March 7, 2018 10:03 PM

To: District3; District4; District1; District2; District5; District 6; District7; Liccardo, Sam; City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; BridgeHousingCommunities; Rork, Christopher; Duenas, Norberto; Pham, Kieulan; Customer Service

Subject: Against BHC in District 3

Dear Officer,

I am Bo Liu, the home owner of

san jose, 95131

I am strongly against BHC in district 3 near the San Jost BART station and even against the bridge housing program for following reasons:

(1) Tax payers' money shall be used to maximize the benefit of the tax payers, community and the city especially for 'public usage'. The bridge housing will benefit homeless persons rather than tax payers. Tax payers has the rights to vote for other usage of such money.

(Based on "Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.", Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution)

(2) Is the shelter the best solution for homeless? Is a place for sleeping really helpful to homeless? Definitely No. They do not have restroom and kitchen, the lack of sufficient supplies can not really help them. More job positions and income are the solid support for homeless. Building shelters is just a temporary trade off solution. Instead, city/government shall create more jobs or offer training programs to make better use of tax payers' money.

(3) Many jobs must get paid to support such program. During meeting, the qualification and security are provided. The goal of helping homeless is to help them finding jobs, paying taxes and benefit the entire community and city. Shelters security and qualification positions are not tax payer oriented.

(4) Lack of sufficient supplies, food/bathroom/kitchen, shows high potential security concern. If city does stick to building bridge housing, the location shall be more supplies friendly for food/bathroom/kitchen/commute and corresponding.

(5) High-Tech surroundings may not be friendly for homeless job seekers. There come more high-tech companies in north San Jose region, the bar of qualification is high and calls for long time training. The location surrounded with high tech companies is not homeless who may not have long time training.

Hope you can hear and consider my voice. Thanks.

Your Sincerely,

Bo Liu

From: bob tom

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 4:29 PM

Subject: Re: from Blair Beekman. Monday March 5, 2018. _____ Big Belly - Smart Trash Can Project - Downtown San Jose.

I have sent this letter, to country supervisors, s.j. city council, its mayor, a long list of its city government regulars. From city managers and attorneys, to dept.heads.

For my first time, I have also sent this letter, to all the staff, of the s.j. downtown assoc.

-blair

On Mon, Mar 5, 2018 at 4:15 PM, bob tom <

wrote:

Dear city government of San Jose, and county of Santa Clara,

It is my assumption, the Big Belly smart trash can project, is a VTA approved project, in some form.

I have been told, this project, has been with the help, of the downtown association.

This project seems to be, a Broken Windows policy. An era we are supposed to be maturing from, as a community and a society.

It is also supposed to time, to leave the ideas of war, and to begin an era, of better trust and peace, between government and its people.

I hope VTA committees,, s.j.neighborhood associations, s.j. government, and even federal govt. oversight, on this project,

can simply understand, the usual rhythm and traditions, in the continual questions of homeless, and small time drug use, in downtown San Jose.

The future issues of downtown San Jose, and its gentrification ideas, is a very sensitive issue

I feel, there are simpler, friendlier, more human choices, to monitor the ebb and flow, and future of life downtown.

I do not think, there are dire needs issues, or overburdened, downtown law enforcement needs.

I feel, there is minimal gunfire, minimal violent crime, and national security issues, downtown.

Please understand, how the people of downtown, work with mostly the same commitment to non-violence, as do city officials and law enforcement.

For all of its problems, this is a part of how, downtown San Jose, is continually one of the more mellow downtowns, of a major u.s. city.

I feel this something, of the regular, good thinking, and those around San Jose government, health, and social programs.

With this said, it can be implied, that smart trash can tech. and its surveillance tech., will be mostly be used, to pick up on, small-time drug and petty theft issues.

A major concern, to groups like the downtown association.

It will do this, with eavesdropper and video tech. If not for small time criminal issues, the job of this smart tech. will be to monitor the conversations, of the everyday people, and life of downtown. And use this, for awareness, cataloging, and statistical purposes.

And to help prepare, how to build the future of downtown.

These Smart Trash Cans, will also possibly have, small cell, broadband emissions center. I worry, this may sicken people, hanging around the trash cans, for long periods of time.

This country, and its local communities, can be at a time, to begin to be moving towards, compassion, better reasoning, and peace.

Civil rights, civil protections, and social justice issues, that are open, positive, and giving, toward a more thoughtful, sustainable era, after fifteen years, of confusion and war

I do not think, the current question of downtown, is a gunshot, violent crime, or national security issue.

It is a simple question, of how to answer, the continual homelessness and drug use, in downtown San Jose, at this time. And, why this is an ire, to some.

From time to time, there are calls, for law and order, 'and to clean up', downtown San Jose,

And, for over 40 years, from this clamor and its thought, there is almost always a return, to the simple, well respected, holistic ideas, of one-on-one dialogue, trust, and good communication.

And, simple, practical thinking, between city government, advocacy, everyday people of the community, health workers, and follow up social programs. And those of law enforcement, and law and order, as well.

It is clear to most, with the new Big Belly, Smart Trash Can project, local government, the VTA, and the downtown business assoc., has possibly crossed several lines, in respected civil rights, civil protections, health, safety, and welfare issues.

I feel, we are at an uncomfortable moment, as a community. The question is, what to do about this.

To begin, please offer simple, clear explanations, at this time. And, to those less experienced, like myself.

Please feel the Big Belly smart trash can project, can be temporary and experimental. Please be open and prepared, to take away this technology, immediately. Or in a short, reasonable amount of time.

And before the lives, of the everyday people of downtown, are misused, entrapped, wrongly manipulated, and hurt.

Please return, to how the city of San Jose, continually works out its problems with downtown, in more open, organic, and holistic ways.

sincerely,

blair beekman

san jose, ca.

as a p.s.

look up Big Belly.com. to understand the corporate intentions, of this product.

It seems it is time, to better introduce, to the VTA board and possible federal agencies, around this project, a public guideline process, is what can honestly be, the most innovative ideas around technology, at this time.

Along with inventiveness, and its business practices, social responsibility, open accountability to the public, and the ideas of peace, not war, it is simply an important third leg of a stool. And, In the future of technology practices for a community, at this time.

I think this should help define, the spring and summer of 2018, for VTA boards. And hopefully for the Downtown Neighborhood Assoc.

Nothing may arrive from this learning process. But, a knowledge will have started, in a peaceful , more open democratic process, that is possible at this time.

That most cynically feel, is not possible.

And do not know how it is possible, to work towards this transition.

Re: a letter Blair Beekman. Wednesday, March 7, 2018. ____ A few thoughts from 2017, to continue into 2018.

bob tom <

7/2018 8:21 PM

Sorry for the hour. I hope this letter about local democracy, can get through.

On Wed, Mar 7, 2018 at 1:55 PM, bob tom <

> wrote

Dear UASI staff, and regional approval board,

Items below, I talked about often, as a member of the public, as I attended most BAUASI regional meetings, in 2017. It is time to offer these subjects again, to review, remind, and address, for all of 2018

CBRNE Technology in 2018, and the future.

1. After a somewhat free pass, has been given to the people involved, in new CBRNE tech. ideas, the past few years, I hope they are beginning to identify, what its corporate greed, and simply purchasing technology, for its own sake, can be better understood.

Please remember, this should be the time, in learning the ideas, of what better social responsibility can be. As we are obviously, at a beginning, of new era, in peace, better reasoning, more open, communicative, trusting ways, local government can work, fifteen years after 9/11/01.

It is important to understand the concept, of the minimal use process, and the sharing of CBRNE tech. with a neighboring city, or county. This should always be considered, as a first option.

As this offers the ideas, of simpler city budgets. And the better ideas, of what can be streamlining, efficiency, better oversight and management.

And, an overall less risks. This includes health risks, to the people who will be hands on, with this CBRNE technology.

The CVE Program.

2. I hope the new, Countering Violent Extremism program, CVE, a new, more low key idea, as a data collecting program, is learning to talk with everyday people of local communities. And with the people of the mid-2000's, that helped define, the civil rights and civil protections, of the Muslim community, in the early days after 9/11/01.

Good thinking ideas, in human rights and civil protections, we are working with, to this day.

I hope, you can also learn to talk with, everyday activists of today, in the local neighborhood communities, of the Bay Area, to learn, what is happening now, like with ideas, in simple, good communication.

I hope you can take comfort, that it is dialogue, and good communication with a community, that is first. Then comes tools and technology ideas, like the CVE program, to help with this local process, on their terms, and their needs.

Federal Immigration Agencies in 2018.

3. The immigration issue, I hope is front and center in your work, on BAUASI issues. at this time. The ideas, to practice, safety, health, and welfare issues, needs to be first and foremost, in the work of federal ICE, HSI, and Custom Agencies, in local Bay Area communities, in 2018.

From the ICE raid process, to the follow up detention process, the ICE-HSI raid process, needs to return, to respecting human rights issues, and ideas of good civil rights. And as we are at a time, in how to better leave, the era of war, and the time of 9/11/01.

Openness, trust, good reasoning, and good communication, is what we all need to work through together, as local communities, at this time.

So I feel, progressive leadership, is important for UASI staff, at this time. And, to be able to offer, valuable insight, in human rights and civil rights issues. It is my hope, other federal agencies, have been surprised with these possibilities, and now may be politely interested, in learning these ideas.

And, in what can be the progressive thinking, of BAUASI.

Again, important to note, that can help, with these immigration questions, at this time. BAUASI, since around 2014, has been making, important, almost ground breaking, new commitments, to openness, cooperation, better communication, and even the ideas of peace, in leaving the time, of secretiveness and non-communication, in the days after 9/11/01.

Other newly staffed, federal agencies, may need this from BAUASI, at this time.

Please learn to understand, the unity there can be around immigration issues, at this time. It is an idea, not to further divide. Or work, with clever, new compromises. Or call people enemies or snakes. And in the current debate, that brakes should be put on,

darker skinned immigration,

Overall, I feel it is time to begin to build, long term, unifying ideas, in north american immigration, migration, and refugee patterns.

Please understand, the good work going on, with the State of California, and with immigration issues.

And on the local level, the 'all down the line' approach, used by counties, like Santa Clara County. Where everyday people, advocacy, professionals, and local government, all work together, 'all down the line', to be sure, within their place, at the local level, no one will be picked up, in ICE raid sweeps.

It is a concept, that everybody at a county level, says no, to the federal ICE raid process. And from this, 'an everyone is accounted for' process. If someone is picked up, in an ICE raid, someone will find this person, the legal right to have a lawyer.

There is simply, a unifying future of immigration. That must be worked on. It includes, human and civil rights issues, not intended to lock people up.

To also note, please consider ideas, of the audit processes, as healthy, in the concepts of checks and balances, at this time. And, that can help offer, a more clear picture, how a local government, can work through its problems, and lack of communication.

The federal agency name - UASI.

4. And finally, I hope how to change the name of UASI, is being talked about, a bit more often, by your staff.

At lunch time, at coffee breaks, and in all the in-between time you have, during your busy days.

I have been bringing up this subject, for a year, and a half, now, in regional public meetings.

Its name, can bring up a subject, we should maturing from, in this country.

We have opened this box, and have seen something pretty horrific, and partially why, this name is being used.

To shine a light, and a time of war, and some who fought war, against ideals we did not like,

And in this country's grief of life, we have taken on the mantle of, ' the other ', and their ideals.

The current name UASI, is a reminder, of our past cynicism, and an acknowledgement, of the deep recesses, and the subconscious.

Along with, the shortcomings and failures, of some of the everyday people, of this country.

The name UASI, has officially shown a light, on a foreign country, from World War II, and its past mistakes.

It name is to partially make light, of this countries, current troubles and worries, as well.

I would guess, we feel overall, cynical, horrible, and terrible. what we have done to ourselves as a country, since the early days, of 9/11/01.

I would really like to begin to think about, how to move on, to this country's own good ideals, and how this will create its future.

A new name for UASI, can reflect this.

I think changing the name UASI, would end some ideas of institutional racism, and an overall cynicism, many feel they become trapped, or stuck in. Or there is no way out of.

And finally, to joke, but to also be, ' thinking on a coffee break', maybe the new name, can reflect, something of the healing work, efficiency, practicality, and mellowness, of a turkey vulture, may be more important, than the eagle.

As both of these birds, can possibly be noticed, on the BAUASI emblem.

Good luck, in thinking of good names.

Sincerely,
Blair Beekman

From: Huiyi Luan

Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 7:02 PM

To: RSP; City Clerk

Subject: Opposing Section 8 mandate and Supporting Criminal eviction reason

I'm writing to:

1: Opposed to the Section 8 and voucher mandate

2: Support an additional Just Cause reason to address crimes related to gangs, drugs, and weapons.

I'm a landlord who has been housed and still is housing section 8 tenants for over ten year. I can tell you from my experience that tenants who are gangs, making and/or selling drugs, and own weapons are very difficult, almost alway dangerous, to communicate to and more likely to trash/damage property. Housing's 6 month inspection only list out things landlord need to fix, but never teach/require the section 8 tenants the to be a responsible tenants. All these reasons plus many others made the landlord too expensive to house section 8 tenants. That is the reason I OPPOSED to the section 8 and voucher mandate.

Sincerely,

---Pauline Luan

From: C lin
Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 5:18 PM
To: RSP
Cc: City Clerk
Subject: Oppose Section 8 and voucher mandate

Hello,

I'm writing to oppose this mandate because of the following reasons:

1. Tenants with government voucher often manipulate the program and abuse the intent that people are here trying to help them. I have a tenant who lied to me that she's qualified for sect 8 and in fact she is not. She takes advantage of my helping hand, obtain the keys and never pay rent. The voucher she promised to come, never come.
2. Sect 8 inspector puts burden on landlords, exaggerates the building and maintenance issues, makes landlord a run around trying to meet their requirements and no compensation is paid to landlord to work extra to meet their requirements.
3. Voucher housing is government's responsibility, not the landlords. The property taxes collected by the government should be used to provide building additional low income housing, not to be used to squeeze home owners.
4. It seems to me that the city has spend a lot of time trying to squeeze the living space and life out of the home owners, this is a wrong path. You will lose votes on your next election if you keep doing this. City should spend more time and energy trying to enhance the 100 year old building code to meet the 21st century city life. The building code is there to help people build houses, not to restrict people to build houses. Please simplify your buildin6g code and permit process, let people build more houses and high rises, allow zoning changes! Why do you hold onto a 100 year old zoning when there is housing shortage?

Home owners are having harder and harder time to maintain and manage their rental properties in Bay Area. Higher construction costs and extra government codes have push the landlords to a point to give up all the rental business.. It's time to help the home owners too! They're your citizens too! They are your voters too!

Thanks for your attention. /Calvin Lin

From: degifford@aol.com

Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 2:20 PM

To: City Clerk; RSP

Subject: Opposition to Housing proposal forcing use of inefficient system. Crime prevention

To whom this may concern,

1. Please do not require renting to section 8 and vouchers. Delays and uncertainty is expensive. This system is inefficient and burdensome working for only a few, not me.
2. Please support an additional Just Cause reason to address crimes related to gangs, drugs, and weapons.

Thank you,
Duane Gifford

From: Fran Turano

Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 11:08 AM

To: RSP; City Clerk

Subject: FW: FW:

Please count me on the following. And thank you.

- Opposed to the Section 8 and voucher mandate
- Support an additional Just Cause reason to address crimes related to gangs, drugs, and weapons.

Some reasons to oppose mandate for Section 8 and voucher program:

- Processing time is 4+ weeks (lost rent).
- First payment takes 4-6 weeks.
- Inspection guidelines often stricter than code enforcement.
- Often a long wait for non-profits to fund tenant's deposit.
- Approved rent amount not known until inspection and review of comparable rents.
- Additional fees, staffing, petitions and associated fines.
- No outreach to single family home, duplex, or condo owners.
- Need to address administrative burden of voucher programs.

From: Judy Li
Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 10:49 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Important!!!

Opposed to the Section 8 and voucher mandate

- Support an additional Just Cause reason to address crimes related to gangs, drugs, and weapons.

Sent from my iPhone

From: casper leung
Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 10:40 AM
To: RSP; City Clerk
Subject: Opposed

I opposed to the section 8 and voucher mandate. Support an additional just cause reason to address crimes related to gangs, and weapons.

Thank You!

Casper Leung

From: Cheryl

Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 2:30 PM

To: RSP; Nguyen, Viviane; VanderVeen, Rachel; Wright, Sara; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky; Liccardo, Sam; Henninger, Ragan; Davis, Dev; Garavaglia, Christina; Nguyen, Tam; Moua, Louansee; Khamis, Johnny; Fedor, Denelle; Connolly, Shane Patrick; Jones, Chappie; Ferguson, Jerad; Pressman, Christina; Diep, Lan; Lebron, Charisse; District2; District3; District5; District8; District9; City Clerk

Subject: Re: Opposed to proposed Section 8 and voucher mandate

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Our hard-working Housing Department has been kind enough to reply to my email today.

They clarified that the Section 8 / Voucher Ordinance is not intended to mandate that landlords sign up for the voucher programs. The purpose is to not advertise NO Section 8, and to fairly process applications. And, there will be efforts in place to work on addressing the deficiencies of the programs and educating people.

And, they are not looking to increase Housing fees.

It is well understood that it is disheartening to have a voucher and not be considered by many housing providers.

We do our best to treat our tenants very fairly and maintain a place where they feel safe and proud of where they live.

Thank you for reading, once again.

Cheryl

On Mar 3, 2018 12:34 AM, "Cheryl"

> wrote:

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

In regards to the proposed "Source of Income" Ordinance that would mandate landlords to accept Section 8 and all other housing subsidy programs, and could apply to all rentals in San Jose (single family homes, duplexes, condos, guesthouses, 3+units, etc.), I am opposed for the following reasons:

- Processing time is 4+ weeks (lost rent).
- First payment takes 4-6 weeks.
- Inspection guidelines often stricter than code enforcement.
- Often a long wait for non-profits to fund tenant's deposit.

- Approved rent amount not known until inspection and review of comparable rents.
- New fees, staffing, petitions and associated fines.
- No outreach to single family home, duplex, or condo owners.

An alternative proposal is to engage with the Santa Clara County Housing Authority and tailor the program for San Jose, similar to what the Oakland Housing Authority is doing (risk-based inspections, loans to improve properties, automatic approval of rent increases, rents determined by local data). <http://kalw.org/post/housing-vouchers-fail-bay-area#stream/0>

Please consider addressing the faults with the system instead of mandating a policy with administrative hassles and lost rent.

Thank you,.

Cheryl

From: Henry Liang
Sent: Sunday, March 4, 2018 11:10 PM
To: RSP; City Clerk
Subject: Opposed to the Section 8 and voucher mandate

Dear City Clerk,

I strongly

- Opposed to the Section 8 and voucher mandate
- Support an additional Just Cause reason to address crimes related to gangs, drugs, and weapons.

Thank you.

From: Jenny Fan

Sent: Sunday, March 4, 2018 10:32 PM

To: City Clerk

Subject: Opposing Section 8 mandate and Supporting Criminal eviction reason

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing this mail to express that I am

- Opposed to the Section 8 and voucher mandate
- Support an additional *Just Cause* reason to address crimes related to gangs, drugs, and weapons.

Sincerely,

Jenny Fan

This email and any attachments are intended for the sole use of the named recipient(s) and contain(s) confidential information that may be proprietary, privileged or copyrighted under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, copy, or forward this email message or any attachments. Delete this email message and any attachments immediately.

From: Silk Iron

Sent: Sunday, March 4, 2018 7:30 PM

To: RSP; City Clerk

Subject: Oppose Section 8 and voucher mandate

Hello,

I'm writing to oppose this mandate because of the following reasons:

1. Tenants with government voucher often manipulate the program and abuse the intent that people are here trying to help them. I have a tenant who lied to me that she's qualified for sect 8 and in fact she is not. She takes advantage of my helping hand, obtain the keys and neverpay rent. The voucher she promised to come, never come.
2. Sect 8 inspector puts burden on landlords, exaggerates the building and maintenance issues,makes landlord a run around trying to meet their requirements and no compensation is paid tolandlord to work extra to meet their requirements.
3. Voucher housing is government's responsibility, not the landlords. The property taxes collected by the government should be used to provide building additional low income housing, not to be usedto squeeze home owners.
4. It seems to me that the city has spend a lot of time trying to squeeze the living space and life out of the home owners, this is a wrong path. You will lose votes on your next election if you keep doing this.
City should spend more time and energy trying to enhance the 100 year old building code to meet the 21st century city life. The building code is there to help people build houses, not to restrict people tobuild houses. Please simplify your building code and permit process, let people build more houses and high rises, allow zoning changes! Why do you hold onto a 100 year old zoning when there is housing shortage?

Home owners are having harder and harder time to maintain and manage their rental properties in Bay Area. Higher construction costs and extra government codes have push the landlords to a point to give up all the rental business.. It's time to help the home owners too! They're your citizens too! They are your voters too!

Thanks for your attention

Grace Xu

From: Bill Moody

Sent: Sunday, March 4, 2018 3:36 PM

To: City Clerk

Subject: Justcause addition

This will hurt the real estate market and as a Realtor I urge you to vote this down.

From: benjamin huang
Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 11:57 AM
To: RSP; City Clerk
Cc: benjamin huang
Subject: Opposing Section 8 mandate and Supporting Criminal eviction reason

Hi

Here I am sending email to

- Opposed to the Section 8 and voucher mandate
- Support an additional *Just Cause* reason to address crimes related to gangs, drugs, and weapons.

reasons to oppose mandate for Section 8 and voucher program:

- Processing time is 4+ weeks (lost rent).
- First payment takes 4-6 weeks.
- Inspection guidelines often stricter than code enforcement.
- Often a long wait for non-profits to fund tenant's deposit.
- Approved rent amount not known until inspection and review of comparable rents.
- Additional fees, staffing, petitions and associated fines.
- No outreach to single family home, duplex, or condo owners.
- Need to address administrative burden of voucher programs.

Thanks You!

SJWC rates

Hans Sitte

Wed 3/7/2018 10:32 PM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>;

To the Rules subcommittee,

My name is Hans Sitte and I live, and have for nearly 22 years, in San Jose and I'm a SJ Water Co. ratepayer who is writing in support of CM Rocha's Memo requesting the City of SJ become a party to the proceeding in San Jose Water Company's general rate case with the CPUC.

San Jose Water Co.'s never ending water rate increases are unsustainable. The ratepayers' protests are ignored by the CPUC and so are the recommendations of the Office of Ratepayer Advocates within the CPUC. Compared to ratepayer protests, a City the size of San Jose has a much greater chance to influence the CPUC to decide in favor of the ratepayer in SJ Water Co.'s general rate case. A decision favoring the ratepayers, would bring relief to the 800,000 ratepayer/residents living in San Jose. I urge the Committee to vote "yes" on CM Rocha's Memo.

Our water rates have increased faster than most other costs of living in San Jose. Our rates should be comparable to other water suppliers in the bay area or, as an alternative, we should be allowed to opt out of San Jose Water Company and select another supplier, much like it is done with other utilities in other part's of the country!

Regards,
Hans Sitte

Agenda item 14;ROGC18-132

Kathy Haren

Thu 3/8/2018 12:08 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>;

My name is Kathy Haren and I live in San Jose and I'm a SJ Water Co. ratepayer who is writing in support of CM Rocha's Memo requesting the City of SJ become a party to the proceeding in San Jose Water Company's general rate case with the CPUC. San Jose Water Co.'s never ending water rate increases are unsustainable. The ratepayers' protests are ignored by the CPUC and so are the recommendations of the Office of Ratepayer Advocates within the CPUC. Compared to ratepayer protests, a City the size of San Jose has a much greater chance to influence the CPUC to decide in favor of the ratepayer in SJ Water Co.'s general rate case. A decision favoring the ratepayers, would bring relief to the 800,000 ratepayer/residents living in San Jose. I urge the Committee to vote "yes" on CM Rocha's Memo.

Kathy Haren

Sent from my iPad

VTA Request - please share with City Council Members

VTA Board Secretary

Thu 3/8/2018 6:36 PM

2018 Emails

To: VTA Board Secretary

Cc: Ledbetter, Lauren

Dear City Clerks,

Please share the Draft Countywide Bicycle Plan Update links to your City Council Members so they may share it with their constituents. Please note comments and questions are due on Monday, March 19, 2018.

Link to the page: www.vta.org/bikeplan

Link to the document: <http://bit.ly/2Ga9GTu>

Interactive map: <https://gis.vta.org/bikeplan/>

Link to a blog post about the plan: <http://www.vta.org/News-and-Media/Connect-with-VTA/Let-Us-Know-What-You-Think-About-Our-Countywide-Bike-Plan>

Comments can be sent to:

Thank you.

Board Secretary's Office
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

San Jose, CA 95134-1927
Phone



Solutions that move you

Conserve paper. Think before you print.