



# Memorandum

**TO:** Honorable Mayor &  
City Council

**FROM:** Toni J. Taber, CMC  
City Clerk

**SUBJECT:** The Public Record  
April 29, 2021 to May 6, 2021

**DATE:** May 12, 2021

---

## **ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD**

### **Letters from Boards, Commissions, and Committees**

#### **Letters from the Public**

1. Letter from Susan Babbel, dated April 28, 2021 regarding Lowing come housing close to Google Headquarters.
2. Letter from Joan Bucher Ellison (Symonds)/Julian Symonds, dated April 29, 2021 regarding I support the Downtown West Mixed Use project.
3. Letter from Consuelo Maria Mata-Lopez, dated April 29, 2021 Protect SAP Center at San Jose - Planning Commission Agenda 4-28-21 item 8.a.
4. Letter from Leigh Ann Ryder, dated April 30, 2021 regarding Protect SAP Center at San Jose.
5. Letter from Chen Chen, Joanna Flores, Timothy Gale, Shu Huan Savannah Huang, Troy Smith and Mary Young, dated April 30, 2021 regarding Public comment - May 4 City Council meeting, open forum
6. Letter from Servio Lee, dated April 30, 2021 regarding Please fund safer Streets.
7. Letter from Ewen Denney, dated May 2, 2021 regarding Please fund safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
8. Letter from John Kelly, dated May 3, 2021 regarding Death of bicyclist.
9. Letter from Kenneth M. Colson, dated May 3, 2021 regarding Removal of Shade Trees on Harrison Street.
10. Letter from the Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits, dated May 3, 2021 regarding Principles for an Equitable Recovery.
11. Letter from Patricia Blevins, dated May 4, 2021 regarding Support jobs and homes near transit - Planning Commission 2021-04-28 Agenda Items 8(a) and 8(b).
12. Letter with attachments from Martha O'Connell, dated May 5, 2021 regarding HCDC recommendation for mandatory tracking of evictions in Mobilehome Parks.

13. Letter from Hung Nguy (Henry), dated May 5, 2021 regarding San Jose City should follow "Federal Government's Approach on Flavor Ban Tobacco".



---

Toni J. Taber, CMC  
City Clerk

TJT/tt

## Fw: Lowing come housing close to Google Headquarters

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 4/29/2021 1:34 PM

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

### Agenda Desk

City of San José | Office of the City Clerk  
200 East Santa Clara St. – Tower 14th Fl.  
San José, CA 95113-1905  
Phone 408.535.1275 | Fax 408.292.6207  
[agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov)

Live updates of City Council Meetings can be found on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).

---

**From:** PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 29, 2021 1:21 PM

**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Cc:** Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov>; Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** FW: Lowing come housing close to Google Headquarters

### Correspondence for City Council packet

---

**From:** Susan Babbel [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 28, 2021 6:10 PM

**To:** PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Lowing come housing close to Google Headquarters

[External Email]

I have noticed that on the maps the proposed low income housing to be placed near the new Google headquarters, is all located within a very small area. I live at Cahill Park as an owner, and live across the street from the low income housing built a year ago. The transition has been difficult with many more call responses from police, fire response teams, and ambulances. Theft of packages has gone up dramatically since it opened. Trash in the area has gone up, as well as cars double parked and parked illegally of people visiting those that live in the building. My concern is with so many more units going up within a several block radius, that area of town will become the new projects.

I realize there is a great need for low income housing, of which I approve of, so I would like to propose that managers live on site, and security round-the-clock be hired to help with all of the above mentioned problems. Additionally, there have been many more smokers that come outside to smoke. They end up crossing the street to Cahill Park since they have to be 25 feet away from a building. So they come to our building. smoking and trash both need to be thought of in the proposals.

Finally, there is no parking. I realize that everyone is supposed to take public transportation, but in reality that does not always happen. As it is my friends that come to visit have to park far away to see me. Many of them do not live close to public transportation.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to a long time, original Cahill Park owner.

Susan

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

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

## Fw: I support the Downtown West Mixed Use project

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 4/29/2021 1:35 PM

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

### Agenda Desk

City of San José | Office of the City Clerk  
200 East Santa Clara St. – Tower 14th Fl.  
San José, CA 95113-1905  
Phone 408.535.1275 | Fax 408.292.6207  
[agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov)

Live updates of City Council Meetings can be found on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).

---

**From:** PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 29, 2021 1:22 PM

**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Cc:** Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov>; Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** FW: I support the Downtown West Mixed Use project

### Correspondence for City Council packet

---

**From:** Joan Bucher [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 29, 2021 6:10 AM

**To:** PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** I support the Downtown West Mixed Use project

[External Email]

I own a home close to the SAP Center in the St Leo neighborhood and enjoy attending Sharks games. My husband and I walk or ride our bikes everywhere including grocery shopping and errands. We also use CalTrain to go to Palo Alto and Mt View. We are against encouraging people to use their cars. We are FOR using trains, bikes and other modes of transportation. People will not change their habits until they are confronted with the need to change. That is how I changed from using a car. We sold one car last year due to lack of use and only have one car now.

Property values will increase and quality of life will improve with this plan.

In order to achieve the City's mode shift goals, we must put this kind of plan in place that provides choices other than single occupancy vehicles. This is especially true in an area next to what will be a world class transit center, a great bike trail and is urban.

- Too much parking and street space for cars means the City will be stuck in a car-centric mentality.
- Do not water down the plan with more parking and street space for cars. Put people first.

Joan Bucher Ellison (Symonds)

Julian Symonds

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

**Fw: Protect SAP Center at San Jose - Planning Commission Agenda 4-28-21 item 8.a**

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Fri 4/30/2021 4:30 PM

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

**From:** PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 10:45 AM

**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Cc:** Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>; Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** FW: Protect SAP Center at San Jose - Planning Commission Agenda 4-28-21 item 8.a

Correspondence for City Council packet

-----Original Message-----

From: Consuelo Maria Mata [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 3:42 PM

To: PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Protect SAP Center at San Jose - Planning Commission Agenda 4-28-21 item 8.a

[External Email]

To Whom it May Concern:

I have been a very long active Hockey Fan for the San Jose Sharks @the SAP Center for 30+ Years

Please protect the SAP Center for the San Jose Sharks at San Jose.

Regards,

Consuelo Maria Mata-Lopez  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

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

**Fw: Protect SAP Center at San Jose**

Agendadesk &lt;Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

Fri 4/30/2021 1:41 PM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas &lt;rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

**Agenda Desk**

City of San José | Office of the City Clerk  
200 East Santa Clara St. – Tower 14th Fl.  
San José, CA 95113-1905  
Phone 408.535.1275 | Fax 408.292.6207  
[agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov)

Live updates of City Council Meetings can be found on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 1:38 PM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Cc:** Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>; Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Protect SAP Center at San Jose**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

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

---

**From:** Leigh Ann Ryder <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 10:35 AM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Protect SAP Center at San Jose

[External Email]

I am a resident in district 5. I am concerned about Google driving how the area around the arena is used. I work near the 49 stadium and traffic and light rail delays (pre pandemic) were terrible every game due to not enough parking and streets not built to support that. Please don't restrict tank access like that and make attending events difficult



Regards  
Leigh Ann Ryder

iPhone. iTypos. iApologize.

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

**Fw: Public comment - May 4 City Council meeting, open forum**

Agendadesk &lt;Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

Fri 4/30/2021 2:47 PM

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

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 2:37 PM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Public comment - May 4 City Council meeting, open forum**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

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

---

**From:** Mary Young <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 2:33 PM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Cc:** Troy Smith <[REDACTED]>; Timothy Gale <[REDACTED]>; Chen Chen

[REDACTED] Joanna Flores [REDACTED]; Shu Huan Huang

**Subject:** Public comment - May 4 City Council meeting, open forum

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Council Members,

We are a group of current Master of Social Work students at San José State University. This semester, we are advocating for increased access to libraries as part of our social policy class. Therefore, we are writing to you in support of the elimination of late fines from all San José Public Library materials, as detailed in the [Library and Education Commission's 2021 Draft Budget Position Memo](#) issued on February 17, 2021.

Libraries are important cornerstones of a healthy community and provide many benefits. For example, libraries give community members the opportunity to improve their literacy skills, find jobs, access current news and research; they also provide a physical space where individuals

can gather and develop a sense of community and belonging (in non-COVID times). The SJPL also reflects the diversity and character of our community, and the services it provides are truly invaluable as it is often the primary or sole source of accessible, comprehensive information to our community members.

Libraries nationwide are choosing to go completely fine-free on all materials to maximize services and benefits for all patrons. In our research on fine-free libraries, we have found evidence for the following<sup>[1][2][3][4][5][6]</sup>:

- Late fines disproportionately impact patrons from lower socioeconomic households whose accounts are frozen due to inability to pay fines, and discourage them from continuing to use the library due to fear of incurring unpayable fines.
- The elimination of late fines results in increased library patronage, as demonstrated by material checkout and return rates, and number of membership applications and renewals.
- Late fines do not significantly increase material return rates.

We acknowledge SJPL's current efforts to provide equitable access to all users through the elimination of late fines for children's materials and the implementation of alternate fine-repayment programs. However, we believe that these efforts are still insufficient. Patrons from lower socioeconomic households--who are the most affected by late fines--may need to work multiple jobs, or may lack the time, transportation, childcare, etc. to complete the Volunteer Away Your Fines program. These patrons will also be the least likely to be able to afford a new book for the Book Replacement program. Finally, children who participate in the Read Away Your Fines program may come to associate reading with punishment, which negates SJPL's mission to foster lifelong learning.

Therefore, we believe that the total elimination of late fines will increase equity and access to SJPL materials and promote SJPL's mission in the community. We respectfully urge you to prioritize a fines-free library program in the 2021-2022 fiscal year. Thank you for your consideration and for your continued support of the San José Public Library.

Sincerely,

Chen Chen  
Joanna Flores  
Timothy Gale  
Shu Huan Savannah Huang  
Troy Smith  
Mary Young

#### References:

1. [Chicago Public Library](#).
2. [Salt Lake City Public Library](#).
3. [Columbus Metropolitan Library](#).
4. [Fordham Law School](#)
5. [Sunnyvale Public Library](#).

6. [Mountain View Public Library](#).

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

**Fw: Please fund safer Streets**

Agendadesk &lt;Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

Fri 4/30/2021 4:53 PM

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

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 4:49 PM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Please fund safer Streets

---

**From:** Servio Lee [REDACTED] >**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 4:48 PM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Please fund safer Streets

[External Email]

Hello San José Council Members,

The Mercury News [reported](#) that the fourth person killed while riding a bicycle was killed by a motorcycle driver in a crash occurring on April 1st. The City of San José adopted a Vision Zero plan six years ago, and it's unacceptable that we are still living under the constant threat of traffic violence.

I commute to work daily and have first hand witnessed how dangerous the streets of San Jose are for bicyclist. There are limited bike paths or no bike paths at all and most of San Jose was built on a car centric perspective. San Jose is the birth place of innovation and moving away from car centric culture to a more environmentally conscious, sustainable, and people centric culture is crucial to maintaining its status as a world leading city.

The streets that we have in San José are needlessly dangerous, and we need you to show that you are committed to fixing that. I am writing to ask the city to approve the proposed \$5,500,000 towards implementing Vision Zero projects in fiscal year 21/22.

Please make us safer,

Servio Lee

Fund safer streets now.

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

**Fw: Please fund safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians**

Agendadesk &lt;Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

Mon 5/3/2021 8:30 AM

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

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, May 3, 2021 8:23 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** FW: Please fund safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians

-----Original Message-----

From: Ewen Denney [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2021 4:57 PM

To: City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

Subject: Please fund safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians

[External Email]

Dear SJ Council,

I am dismayed to see that another cyclist has died on our streets this year, an inevitable consequence of the lack of concern that is shown by our city to cycling safety.

I would like to strongly encourage you to improve bike safety in San Jose. In the pre-coronavirus days I would commute from my home in San Jose to my work in Mountain View, combining a bike ride with Caltrain and VTA - the difference in bike safety in San Jose and Mountain View was, I'm sorry to say, noticeable.

Please work towards Vision Zero, and approve the Freedom to Walk Act.  
It's ridiculous the extent to which our laws are pro-motorist and anti-pedestrian/cyclist.

I would like to be able to boast to friends and colleagues who live in other Bay Area cities that I live in San Jose, a city known for its progressive approach to cycle safety. We're far from that.

Ewen Denney

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

**Fw: Death of bicyclist****Agendadesk** <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 5/3/2021 8:30 AM

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

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, May 3, 2021 8:23 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** FW: Death of bicyclist

---

**From:** John Kelly [REDACTED]**Sent:** Monday, May 03, 2021 2:04 AM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Death of bicyclist

[External Email]

Hello,

The Mercury News [reported](#) that a man riding a bicycle was killed by a motorcycle driver due to a crash on April 1 near Leigh and San Carlos streets. The City of San Jose adopted a Vision Zero plan six years ago, and it's unacceptable that we are still living under the threat of traffic violence. People don't feel safe biking on city streets, and for good reasons. I have personally been hit twice by cars on our streets while biking to/from work in Cupertino.

The streets that we have here are needlessly dangerous, and we need to show that we are committed to fixing that. I am writing to ask the city to budget a minimum of \$5,000,000 towards implementing Vision Zero projects in fiscal year '21-'22.

Thanks for you time,  
John

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

**Fw: Removal of Shade Trees on Harrison Street**

Agendadesk &lt;Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

Mon 5/3/2021 2:40 PM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas &lt;rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, May 3, 2021 2:28 PM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** FW: Removal of Shade Trees on Harrison Street

---

**From:** Ken Colson [REDACTED]**Sent:** Monday, May 03, 2021 2:09 PM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fwd: Removal of Shade Trees on Harrison Street

[External Email]

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Ken Colson [REDACTED]**Date:** May 3, 2021 at 10:39:43 AM PDT**To:** Dev Davis <[dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov)>, Sam Liccardo <[sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov)>, John Ristow <[john.ristow@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:john.ristow@sanjoseca.gov)>, "[cityclerk@sanjosseca.gov](mailto:cityclerk@sanjosseca.gov)" <[cityclerk@sanjosseca.gov](mailto:cityclerk@sanjosseca.gov)>**Subject:** Removal of Shade Trees on Harrison Street**Reply-To:** Ken Colson [REDACTED]

Dear Decision Makers: the proposed removal of 15 to 25 shade trees on Harrison Street is a short sighted, poorly thought out, and stupid. A premier tree should never be cut down because of their roots, To not use effective mediation of roots for curb and street repair is the epitome of laziness and ignorance of alternative methods to save the trees and do the needed street maintenance.

That trees facing removal can be saved, I invite you to look at the Hetch Hetchy waterline project in the Fairoaks Neighborhood of Menlo Park. The San Francisco water department needed to replace a large water pipe e that ran under a gigantic oak tree for those decision makers the only way to replace the pipe was to cut down the mighty oak. But the residents and members of the community would have non of that. After prolonged legal and resident dialogue with San Francisco, the Water Department decided to trench. under the oak.

Thus a heritage oak was saved by a creative solution. Yes it was costly, but so is the loss of shade trees and their effective role in cleaning the air. How much is cleaner air worth?



So come on and think outside the box and do the right thing for the residents and for San Jose, don't chop down those trees. The proposed replacement with new trees is a sop.

Sincerely,

Kenneth M. Colson



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

## Fw: Principles for an Equitable Recovery

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 5/4/2021 8:27 AM

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

 1 attachments (144 KB)

5.03.21 CSJ - Principles for an Investment Agenda for Recovery.pdf;

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 4, 2021 8:20 AM

**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Fw: Principles for an Equitable Recovery

---

**From:** Nick Kuwada [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, May 3, 2021 7:34 PM

**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>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Cc:** Reed, Jim <Jim.Reed@sanjoseca.gov>; Gomez, David <David.Gomez@sanjoseca.gov>; Sandoval, Vanessa <vanessa.sandoval@sanjoseca.gov>; Ramos, Christina M <christina.m.ramos@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; Lupercio, Adan <Adan.Lupercio@sanjoseca.gov>; Groen, Mary Anne <maryanne.groen@sanjoseca.gov>; Kaspar, Nick <Nick.Kaspar@sanjoseca.gov>; McGarrity, Patrick <Patrick.McGarrity@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughes, Scott <scott.hughes@sanjoseca.gov>; Quevedo, Matthew <Matthew.Quevedo@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Sykes, Dave <Dave.Sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Kyra Kazantzis <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Principles for an Equitable Recovery

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Liccardo and distinguished members of the City Council,

Please see attached a document prepared by the Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits, in consultation with the Racial Equity Action Leadership coalition regarding community principles around an equitable recovery. We look forward to your discussion around this and other related items.

Warmest regards,

**Nick Kuwada** | Policy Director | he/him/his

**Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits**

Phone: (408) 409-5591 | Web: [svcnp.org](https://svcnp.org) | Twitter: @SVCN

**Learn more about #FYI21!**



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute, or copy this e-mail.

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

May 03, 2021

Mayor & City Council  
City of San José  
200 East Santa Clara Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

## **Re: Principles for an Investment Agenda for Recovery**

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Members of the City Council:

This document was prepared by the Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits, in consultation with the Racial Equity Action Leadership coalition. We ask that you consider adopting these principles as you make decisions about how to further our community's recovery from the pandemic and its effects and how to use federal funding to advance that recovery.

Recovery planning should be grounded in three main principles:

- Federal rescue funding is the people's money.
- Local governments should not seek to go back to the way things were but should strive towards building a more equitable future for our community.
- The scale of federal resources should be viewed as opportunity to make breakthrough achievements in critical areas, such as alleviating the racial, ethnic, economic, and other disparities that produced so much death and suffering during the pandemic.

### **Transparency**

Federal rescue funding and recovery plans should be highly transparent to the general public, including dashboards and accessible instructions about how to input to decision-making processes.

### **Racial Justice**

Funds should be used in a way that furthers racial justice.

## **Partnership and Coordination**

The County and cities should work together on recovery planning and expenditures so that their efforts complement and not replicate each other; they should also coordinate with other jurisdictions like educational entities, transportation agencies, and public utilities.

The community should be brought to the table—meaningfully—using numerous different accessible avenues. Community-based organizations can be excellent partners to support governments’ efforts to reach community members with relevant lived experience.

Establish a coordinating council that reflects the needs and views of all who live and work in Santa Clara County that can gather community input about strategic investments in our better future, identify gaps, make sure all voices are heard, make recommendations, and then track results.

## **Vision**

Of course, there are still critical safety net needs; addressing those and bringing back lost private and public sector jobs should be priorities. AND, this unique opportunity to invest in our future should also be a priority.

One-time funds should be spent on an investment agenda that creates resilience and supports empowerment in disadvantaged communities. Think big. As examples, other communities are incubating community development corporations and purchasing land for communities in need. Others are investing in transit solutions that bring jobs and healthy transportation opportunities to disadvantaged communities, funding residential power and water and other necessities that lowers costs to lower-income communities, or implementing infrastructure fixes that create climate resilience especially for those who don’t have the means to protect themselves against rising temperatures and flooding. Our community should come together to develop its own investment agenda.

One-time funds may have one-time uses, but they also can be used to achieve ongoing objectives if the community works together to design strategies for sustainability of those objectives.

All expenditures, programs including grant-making should be goal-oriented, strategic, and transparent, and funds should be sufficient to pay for data-keeping, reasonable overhead, and collaboration.

Sincerely,

Kyra Kazantzis, CEO  
**Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits**

Susie Rivera, VP of Youth Voice  
Initiatives and Executive Director of  
Santa Clara County  
**Santa Clara County Fresh Lifelines  
for Youth (FLY)**

Sheri Burns, Executive Director  
**Silicon Valley Independent Living  
Center**

Pete Settelmayer, Executive Director  
**City Year San José**

Jen Loving, CEO  
**Destination: Home**

Beth Leary, Executive Director  
**Family Supportive Housing, Inc**

Sparky Harlan, CEO  
**Bill Wilson Center**

Richard Konda, Executive Director  
**Asian Law Alliance**

Ron Gonzales, President & CEO  
**Hispanic Foundation of Silicon Valley**

David Cox, Executive Director  
**St. Joseph's Family Center**

Wisa Uemura, Executive Director  
**San Jose Taiko**

Gregory Kepferle, CEO  
**Catholic Charities of Santa Clara  
County**

Poncho Guevara, Executive Director  
**Sacred Heart Community Service**

Maritza Maldonado, Founding  
Executive Director  
**Amigos de Guadalupe Center for  
Justice and Empowerment**

Kevin Zwick, CEO  
**United Way Bay Area**

Leslye Corsiglia, Executive Director  
**SV@Home**

Eva M Terrazas, VP Public Policy and  
Special Initiatives  
**Uplift Family Services**

Rhonda Berry, President  
**Our City Forest**

Kathy Cordova, Executive Director  
**Recovery Cafe San Jose**

Megan Fluke, Executive Director  
**Green Foothills**

Andrea Urton, CEO  
**HomeFirst Services**

Louis Chicoine, CEO  
**Abode Services**

Anjee Helstrup-Alvarez, Executive Director  
**MACLA/Movimiento de Arte y Cultura Latino Americana**

Gisela B. Bushey, CEO  
**Loaves & Fishes Family Kitchen**

Marie Bernard, Executive Director  
**Sunnyvale Community Services**

Mindy Berkowitz, Executive Director  
**Jewish Family Services of Silicon Valley**

Heather Cleary, CEO  
**Peninsula Family Service**

Mayra Pelagio, Executive Director  
**Latinos United for a New America**

Rev. Ray F. Montgomery, Executive Director  
**PACT (People Acting in Community Together)**

Dorsey Moore, CEO  
**San Jose Conservation Corps**

Ann Marquart, Executive Director  
**Project Sentinel**

Gloria Baxter, Executive director  
**Lighthouse of Hope**

Michele Lew, Chief Executive Officer  
**The Health Trust**

Jennifer Masuda, Executive Director  
**Yu-Ai Kai**

Salvador Bustamante, Treasurer  
**Latinos United for a New America**

Nathan Svoboda, President  
**Project MORE**

Dolores Alvarado, CEO  
**Community Health Partnership**

Camille Llanes-Fontanilla, Executive Director  
**SOMOS Mayfair**

Sarita Kohli, CEO  
**AACI**

Almaz Negash, Executive Director  
**African Diaspora Network**

Alison Brunner, CEO  
**Law Foundation of Silicon Valley**

Derecka Mehrens, Executive Director  
**Working Partnerships USA**

Darcie Green, Executive Director  
**Latinas Contra Cancer**

David K. Mineta, CEO  
**Momentum for Health**

Quyen Vuong, Executive Director  
**International Children Assistance  
Network (ICAN)**

Kathleen M King, CEO  
**Healthier Kids Foundation**

Veronica Goei, Executive Director  
**Grail Family Services**

Elisa Koff-Ginsborg, Executive  
Director  
**Behavioral Health Contractors'  
Association (BHCA)**

Erin O'Brien, President/CEO  
**Community Solutions**

Lana Nguyen, CFO  
**Mekong Community Center**

Sameena Usman, Senior Government  
Relations Coordinator  
**Council on American-Islamic  
Relations, SFBA**

Milan Balinton, Executive Director  
**African American Community Service  
Agency**



## Fw: Support jobs and homes near transit - Planning Commission 2021-04-28 Agenda Items 8(a) and 8(b)

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Wed 5/5/2021 9:40 AM

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

---

**From:** PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 5, 2021 9:37 AM

**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Cc:** Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov>; Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** FW: Support jobs and homes near transit - Planning Commission 2021-04-28 Agenda Items 8(a) and 8(b)

### Correspondence for City Council packet

---

**From:** Pat Blevins [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 4, 2021 8:27 AM

**To:** PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Support jobs and homes near transit - Planning Commission 2021-04-28 Agenda Items 8(a) and 8(b)

[External Email]

I don't know if its too late to offer an opinion about how the City can support both jobs and homes near transit, but if I may, I think this is the most positive choice.

By placing new homes, whether houses or rental units far from transit lines the City just increases our already intractable problem with traffic. Further, with no real traffic control offered by the police department, individuals drive recklessly and put people's lives in danger.

But if people could live near where they work or have easy access to clean, public transportation, car traffic would not worsen.

Thank you for considering this opinion after the Commission meeting was held.

Patricia Blevins

San Jose

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

GOLDEN STATE MANUFACTURED – HOME OWNERS  
LEAGUEGSMOL Region Manager Region 1 Zone A-1

---

May 5, 2021

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Martha O'Connell, Regional Manager  
Region 1 Zone A-1

RE: HCDC recommendation for mandatory tracking of evictions in  
Mobilehome Parks

At the 4-22-21 meeting of the Housing and Community Development Commission meeting, by a vote of 11-2, the following motion was passed:

**HCDC recommends that submission to the City of notices of termination of tenancy for mobilehome residents be mandatory.**

In its presentation to HCDC, the Housing Department had offered a voluntary monitoring of evictions in Mobilehome Parks but the HCDC strongly felt that a voluntary program would be insufficient.

I attach a letter written by Bruce Stanton, the Corporate Counsel for GSMOL – Golden State Manufactured – Home Owners League. In very pertinent part, Stanton wrote, “I am informed similar reporting exists for San Jose apartment tenancies, which reported with respect to about 400 units when the program was first voluntary and over 10,000 units when it become mandatory.”

This is not the first time that the HCDC has recommended eviction tracking in Mobilehome Parks. I attach a 12-19-18 letter from the then Chair, Andrea Wheeler, which reads in pertinent part, “In addition, the Commission respectfully requests that the City Council identify mobilehome eviction tracking as a potential City Council priority at its next priority-setting session in February 2019.”

**To be of value, eviction tracking in Mobilehome Parks must be mandatory, not voluntary.**





14802 Beach Blvd., La Mirada CA 90638 TEL: (714) 826-4071 FAX: (714) 826-2401

**To:** Viviane Nguyen, Senior Analyst  
Housing Department, City of San Jose

**Date:** May 5 2021

**From:** Bruce E. Stanton, Corporate Counsel  
**cc:** GSMOL Board of Directors; Martha O'Connell, Regional Manager

**Subject:** Program Tracking Notices of Mobilehome Tenancy Terminations

On behalf of the Golden State Manufactured - Home Owners League, Inc. (GSMOL), I am writing to address objections by San Jose mobilehome park owner representatives to the Commission's support for establishing an internal system which tracks notices of termination in mobilehome parks so as to examine trends and analyze opportunities to preserve housing through referrals and limited advocacy. This was listed as Goal No. 4 by the City Housing Department in its April 22, 2021 presentation. By majority vote the Commission voted to recommend that tracking be mandatory, rather than voluntary. (I am informed similar reporting exists for San Jose apartment tenancies, which reported with respect to about 400 units when the program was first voluntary and over 10,000 units when it became mandatory) The goal seems obvious: To look for eviction trends in affordable housing at a time when housing is at a premium and homeowners are subjected to particular risks when becoming homeless during pandemic conditions.

I am informed park owners have made various objections to this Program, alleging a number of grounds. None that I have heard have any merit whatsoever.

First, park owners allege that a change to the state Mobilehome Residency Law (MRL) would be required. Civil Code 798.56 governs the seven (7) "for cause" reasons that a mobilehome tenancy can be terminated in California. But the grounds for termination and the notices required therefor have no connection in any way to a system that a local jurisdiction might implement to track how those "for cause" reasons are actually being implemented within the local community. The MRL does not touch the subjects of tracking or trends, and would leave it to the local jurisdiction to decide whether to do so. The Program does not contemplate anything which would change the State law; it only seeks to know more about how State law is being applied to its residents.

Park owners also allege that such a Program would somehow be superseded or rendered moot by a program recently adopted into State law, and known as the Mobilehome Residency Law Protection Program (MRLPP). This program is administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), who received complaints from mobilehome residents and refers them to local legal providers for action where appropriate. The MRLPP only deals with alleged MRL violations. Wrongful evictions might possibly be one such complaint. But not all tenancy terminations would be referred to the MRLPP by aggrieved residents, nor would it be able to track termination or eviction data throughout San Jose. MRLPP data would only constitute a small subset, at best, of the data that the tracking Program would generate.

Park owners also allege that such a Program would require amendment to the City's Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO). I confess that I do not follow this argument at all. The RSO regulates the amount of rent which a park owner can charge, but has nothing to do with termination of tenancy, or any of the remaining six non-rent related grounds for terminating a mobilehome tenancy found in Civil Code 798.56.

Finally, park owners' object based upon an alleged violation of the residents' privacy. Since the City already tracks apartment terminations this would seem to be an issue that the City would have previously addressed. Of course once an eviction is filed with the court it becomes a public proceeding, subject to certain confidential protocols which are already in place. Other jurisdictions which have such tracking have also assuredly addressed this issue. There would seem to be multiple ways to protect residents' limited privacy rights in connection with such reporting, while still being able to receive and collect the valuable data.

On behalf of GSMOI, I applaud this valuable Program Goal, and would hope that it shall not be derailed by objections which are irrelevant, and more accurately described as excuses for not wishing to participate in the Program. We appreciate the opportunity to communicate with you about this important issue.



December 19, 2018

Mayor Sam Liccardo  
Members of the City Council  
200 E. Santa Clara St, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San José, CA 95113

**RE: Recommended City Council support of Evictions Monitoring Regarding Mobilehome Park Conversion Policy 6-33**

Dear Honorable Mayor Liccardo and City Council,

The letter is to convey to the Mayor and City Council the San José Housing and Community Development Commission's recommendations to request additional scrutiny of evictions at mobilehome parks subject to potential conversions in land use.

The purpose of the City's Housing and Community Development Commission (Commission) is to advise the City Council and the City's Housing Department on policies, programs, and the City's performance in housing and community development. This focus includes issues related to the City's mobilehome rent ordinance, apartment rent ordinance, and other programs in Chapters 17.22 and 17.23 of the San José Municipal Code. Given the Commission's responsibilities, its members are focused on a range of strategies and programs that can help San José's current housing crisis and shortage of affordable housing.

At the Commission's meeting on December 13, 2018, by a unanimous vote, Commission recommended that to provide a letter recommending evictions monitoring at Mobilehome parks regarding Mobilehome Park Conversion Policy 6-33. The Commission discussion indicated continued support for protecting mobilehome parks, for preventing displacement of residents from San José.

San José is home to almost 60 mobilehome parks, housing almost 35,000 people, who make up a particularly vulnerable population:

While mobilehome owners own their homes, they do not own the land beneath the homes.

While the homes are labeled "mobile," they are rarely actually capable of being moved. Even if the home is moveable, there is no available space in any mobilehome park in San José or the Bay Area.

The mobilehome population is generally a moderate- to low-income population, with few financial reserves other than the equity in their home.

A significant percentage of the mobilehome population is 55+, with a very high number of residents who are 70+.

## MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

RE: Recommended City Council Support of Evictions Monitoring

December 19, 2018

Page 2

The mobilehome resident population is now more vulnerable than ever because the current economic environment is creating a strong incentive to convert mobilehome parks to more profitable developments such as office space, retail space, or high density housing. Closing a mobilehome park leaves almost no housing alternatives for mobilehome owner/residents:

As soon as a mobilehome park is under consideration for conversion, the value of their homes drops severely, or they can't sell their homes at all, meaning that they cannot extract the equity from the home to be used to obtain new housing.

The home is not moveable, or there is no space available to move it to, or they don't have the money to move the home and pay higher rents in the new location.

The resident does not have a high enough income to afford market-rate apartments, and cannot find a designated affordable rental unit.

The mobilehome owner does not have other financial reserves to obtain alternative new housing, even including moving costs and deposits for rentals.

**Because of the above reasons, conversion of a mobilehome park can force many mobilehome owners/residents into new housing situations that are much less desirable than their park, including the quality of their new home and neighborhood, and access to needed services such as health care providers.**

**Furthermore, because of the current economic and housing environment, conversion of a mobilehome park creates the very real possibility that significant numbers of mobilehome park residents, including senior residents, will become homeless.**

The Housing and Community Development Commission has discussed the possible conversion of mobilehome parks many times and for many hours in the last several years. We have discussed updates to the existing Mobilehome Park Conversion Ordinance, the proposed Mobilehome Park Closure Ordinance (which was found to be unnecessary in light of the Closure Ordinance), and the proposed Mobilehome Opt-In Ordinance (which was rejected by City Council).

In every discussion, the Commission has recognized the reality that mobilehome park conversions will happen and have consistently focused on protecting the financial, housing, and physical, and mental well-being of the displaced residents. The Commission worked closely with Housing Department staff to ensure that appropriate levels of support are given to the displaced residents in the Mobilehome Park Conversion Ordinance.

During our discussions, the Commission has heard the concern voiced by mobilehome residents that mobilehome park owners will attempt to avoid the requirements of the Mobilehome Park Conversion Ordinance by pre-emptively evicting residents.

**MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

RE: Recommended City Council Support of Evictions Monitoring

December 19, 2018

Page 3

The first mobilehome park, Winchester Ranch Mobilehome Park, is now seriously considering conversion. Recently, residents attended a Commission meeting to complain about eviction notices issued to the residents for minor infractions with minimal notice. The Commission has listened to their complaints and have found them to be credible.

**The Commission believes that it is possible that the park owners may be trying to avoid the requirements of the Conversion Ordinance by pre-emptively evicting residents before formally announcing a park conversion.**

The Commission's concerns extend beyond Winchester Ranch. Other mobilehome park owners will watch this conversion and will follow the example set. If Winchester Ranch Park owners can avoid the requirements of the Conversion Ordinance, other park owners will do the same. The Commission has received feedback from Housing Staff and the City Attorney that the policy addressing possible improper evictions falls under Council Policy 6-33, CONVERSION OF MOBILEHOME PARKS TO OTHER USES, and that any recommendations regarding the evictions must go to the City Council.

**Therefore, please be aware that the Housing and Community Development Commission has requested that Housing Staff apply heightened scrutiny to eviction notices being issued at mobilehome parks that Housing Staff believe are under consideration for conversion, and enforce protections under the City's Municipal Code as needed to prevent residents and mobilehome owners from being pre-emptively evicted in order to avoid the requirements of the Mobilehome Park Conversion Ordinance.**

**In addition, the Commission respectfully requests that the City Council identify mobilehome eviction tracking as a potential City Council priority at its next priority-setting session in February 2019.**

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at Commission6@sanjoseca.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Andrea Wheeler  
Commission Chair



To: Mayor of City of san Jose  
Council Member of 10 Distric.

Dated: May 5th, 2021,

From: Hung Nguy, Franchisee of 7 Eleven [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Re: San Jose City should follow the "Federal Goverment's Approach on Flavor Ban on Tobaco"

Dear Honorable Mayor San Jose City,  
Respective City Council Members,

As our city is grappling with the coronavirus pandemic, I'm troubled by reports that San Jose supports banning the sale of flavored tobacco products. I don't understand why you would consider this economically harmful proposal while essential stores like mine are struggling to stay afloat.

As a retailer who relies on these products for a large portion of my store's sales, this flavor ban would decimate my bottom line. This would also have real implications for the hardworking employees who rely on my business' paychecks to support themselves and their families. In fact, a citywide flavor ban would imperil almost 300 jobs and more than \$5 million in wages. San Jose would lose more than \$27 million in economic productivity and nearly \$1 million in local tax revenue. We did not elect you to impose overreaching policies that will devastate our community.

What's worse is that you're rushing to implement this ban, knowing that Californians will have an opportunity to voice their opinions soon enough. You seem to have forgotten that just last year, a majority of Californians expressed concern with SB 793. It seems you're trying again because the last time Californians voted on this policy, the results did not fit your political agenda.

As I'm sure you know, the federal government does not recommend a total flavor ban. Officials at both the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) recognize that menthol, mint, and wintergreen flavors are statistically unappealing to minors. Furthermore, the CDC's Youth Risk Behavior Survey shows that youth tobacco usage has declined significantly, in part due to retailers who strictly enforce the law. Nevertheless, you're choosing to bypass a health agency's guidance and take matters into your own hands.

Instead of this drastic policy, I would urge you to echo the federal government's approach to flavored nicotine products and vote NO on this legislation. San Jose should also study and support commonsense solutions like youth prevention programs, not bans.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Henry Nguy,  
[REDACTED]