



# Memorandum

**TO:** Honorable Mayor &  
City Council

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

**SUBJECT:** The Public Record  
September 23, 2021 – September 30, 2021

**DATE:** October 6, 2021

---

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

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

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

1. Blair Beekman, dated September 24, 2021, regarding: Blair Beekman. Friday. September. 24, 2021. \_\_\_\_\_ The future of Homeless Transitional Housing. State/Federal Funding & Subsidies. Councilperson Mahan.
2. Letter from Research1, dated September 24, 2021, regarding: YOU can end the housing crisis! - Public Comment.
3. 30 Public Record Items, dated September 27-28, 2021, regarding: 71 Vista Montana Safe RV Parking Site.
33. Letter from National League of Cities, dated September 27, 2021, regarding: Secure Your Representative's YES Vote on Infrastructure TODAY.
34. Letter from Bob Levy, dated September 27, 2021, regarding: Community Forest Management Plan.
35. Letter from Bob Levy, dated September 27, 2021, regarding: Community Forest Management Plan.
36. 13 Responses from Rosalynn Hughey, Deputy City Manager, dated September 29, 2021, attaching Frequently Asked Questions regarding: 71 Vista Montana Safe RV Parking Site.

---

Toni J. Taber, CMC  
City Clerk

Blair Beekman. Friday. September. 24, 2021. \_\_\_\_\_ The future of Homeless Transitional Housing. State/Federal Funding & Subsidies. Councilperson Mahan.

b. beekman <[REDACTED]>

Fri 9/24/2021 3:16 PM

[External Email]

Dear san jose city govt. and community,

To address, councilpersons Mahan ideas, of homelessness, in the future of homeless funding and subsidies.

I have been describing, since early August, important subsidy funding, that is being developed, for local Bay Area cities. as homeless persons, who are currently trying to be placed, in transitional housing, can finally have, steady, continual, larger subsidy programs, to help pay for permanent housing needs.

For decades, it has been a condition, that only, 1 in 3 homeless persons, working with local Bay Area city govts. and that use, transitional housing services, can then take the next step, to permanent housing. Based on the simple fact, that their limited incomes, cannot afford to pay, for permanent housing.

This new subsidy program, from state & federal govt. agencies, in this era of Covid-19, is meant to change that. Quite possibly, 2 in 3 persons, in transitional housing programs, can soon be placed, into permanent housing. This can be, an extraordinary, hopeful statistic, when more considered. And this, is the exact sort of program, that local govt housing agencies, have been waiting for, in how to help define, a better relationship, of local govt, being able, to help find housing, for the homeless & persons of low income.

There is possibly, a very large amount, of subsidy money involved, for this program. And that, I have continually tried to make clear to yourselves, over the past few months. This program, should be arriving soon. Obviously, there is the natural inclination, to develop these well-intentioned, homeless subsidy programs, now. It can also be planned, to work at a slower pace, over the next few years, as

needed. I have been trying to state, since early August, new subsidy and funding ideas, simply has to have, responsible practices, and a good vetting & review process. We cannot simply turn, these sort of good minded, homeless/low income subsidy plans, into a cash bonanza, for the real estate market. Or for our own city govts - to overuse, and spread this funding, too thinly, over many well-intentioned, city govt. dept. projects & ideas.

These are ideas & plans, that have to have, a very human element, of how to directly work, with low income people, themselves. If we can know, how to better address & limit, 'ghettoization' issues, and to acknowledge, the good standards, of the more regular, San Jose eastside and progressive communities, Councilperson Mahans current proposals, of pre-fab housing, and what can be, smaller, sj govt. sponsored encampments - may actually have important concepts, in what we often consider, in homeless planning. And in what we can work towards, as a community, at this time. As I feel, we can again, mostly dismiss, the fairgrounds, as a viable future housing option, the overall awkwardness, in some of Councilperson Mahans, early, ambitious ideas, may simply need to be modified, in some ways.

With all of our homeless efforts, in the next year, whatever they may be, I feel most importantly, we have to continue the efforts, of what can be, responsible planning, in budgeting, and money management. And with simply, a surprising amount, of subsidy & funding, now available, from the state and federal level, in this new era, of Covid-19.

To also note, the state & federal transitional housing subsidy plans, I often talk about - is only, one, of what must be, several, new, funding and subsidy plans, for housing, homeless, and low income issues, that may become, more available, in this new era of Covid-19.

I feel, Councilperson Mahan's inexperience, may have inaccurately described, at RaOG Sept. 22 - upcoming Bay Area homelessness funding, as a competition, with other Santa Clara Co. cities. As San Jose, is a large city, with the largest amount of homeless population. A large amount, of state funding, should be more readily available, than in years past, for local cities. Competition & pressure, between cities, may not be as intense, as in years past.

I am interested, in Councilperson Mahans ideas, to begin to consider, what can be, a few smaller, sj city govt. sponsored encampments, placed, throughout the city. This is an idea, homeless advocacy of San Jose, has been trying to help develop, for years. But to also note, and what may be key, to this process - sj city govt. has also been trying to develop, for years, good permanent housing solutions, for the homeless community. They now can, with this upcoming, state & federal homeless funding & subsidy plans. But again, first & foremost, there simply needs, responsible money management, at this time, in funding, future homeless projects.

I hope, Councilpersons Mahans attempts, can make clear, we simply may be at, important new beginnings, of how city govts. can connect, good housing services, to the community. Councilpersons

Mahans, initial, possibly over-ambitious approach & inexperience, may be, a bit off-putting - but his housing ideas, seem like concepts, many are already considering. To learn, a well reasoned prioritization, of responsible budgeting, of new subsidy and funding programs, first - and to then consider this subsidy/funding money, for more traditional city govt. housing, programs - can then allow for, some interesting prep work, in this next year, to better develop, more experimental ideas, including, Councilperson Mahans ideas, of what can be, small local govt sponsored encampments. And possibly, the portable housing ideas. If we do make the efforts, now, to plan well, with many project ideas & concepts, already, years in the making - hopefully, by this time, next summer, more clear ideas, of how to then, budget & spend, subsidy and funding dollars, more responsibly, for these housing projects, should start to be more clear.

I think the current situation, of Apple property, on 1st st., that has had some good planning, by city govt. and Apple, and that has had, plenty of money to work with. It can be a good example, of the important need, of overall, better community input. And simply learning, how to better trust & invite, everyday community, to the process. I think, there can be lessons learned, from previous years, of what can be, good, community dialogue & negotiation,. And there can now be, better agreements, in how to place, a few, homeless encampments, in the future, of local San Jose neighborhoods.

I think many options, can be good, and worked on, at this point. There can be, continued good efforts, of the housing dept, to develop, permanent housing solutions for people. And, a better planning, in the next 10 months, of small, sj city govt. sponsored encampments. And possibly, of pre-fab homes. All of this, should be with the condition, that subsidy and funding structures, continued to be developed, only in, responsible, good terms.

From all of this, to ask openly, and to ask for clarity - should we be worrying, of a possible, large bay area earthquake, by 2023 ? Yourselfs, can hopefully develop, more clear ideas, from this question & rumor. In possible, earthquake planning questions - is it safer to house, or to not house - I feel, we should be very much planning, safe, organized, homeless services, at the time, of such a natural disaster event. This can also be applicable, to future wildfire, flood, or sea-level rise issues, for san jose, as well. The ideas of this letter, try to address & work in ways, that can be open & flexible, to everyone. It is a system developed, meant to work the same, if there is. or is not, an earthquake, in the next few years. It is a process, that is meant to work, to be open, to all sides, to all ideas, and to all points of view.

Again, it is to be sure, to first budget & prioritize responsibly, and to directly address the needs, of low income & homeless, first - in however, we move forward, in the next few years. I hope we can much work on, and perhaps better define, Councilpersons Mahans offerings. in this next year. I may not have, a depth of knowledge. But I hope, this can be some practical ways, to talk about, homeless issues, of the next few years.

sincerely,  
blair beekman

IPA <[ipa@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:ipa@sanjoseca.gov)>, DoTsj.Dir. John Ristow <[John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov)>, Fire Dept. SJFD. <[SJFDFeedback@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:SJFDFeedback@sanjoseca.gov)>, Police Ofc. Anthony Mata <[anthony.mata@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:anthony.mata@sanjoseca.gov)>, S.J. Arena Authority <[REDACTED]> Police Lt. Heather Randol <[3528@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:3528@sanjoseca.gov)>, cDOT-TrafficDataCtr. <[traffic.signals@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:traffic.signals@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Sabrina Parra <[sabrina.parra-garcia@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sabrina.parra-garcia@sanjoseca.gov)>, Ec.Dvlpt.Dir. Kim Walesh <[Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov)>, cDOT Laura Wells <[laura.wells@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:laura.wells@sanjoseca.gov)>, sjpd Lt. Jason Dwyer-s.ops.. <[jason.dwyer@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:jason.dwyer@sanjoseca.gov)>, police Sgt. Doug Wedge <[Douglas.wedge@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Douglas.wedge@sanjoseca.gov)>, C. Innovation. Rajani Nair <[Rajani.Nair@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Rajani.Nair@sanjoseca.gov)>, z. Sarah Sanchez <[Sarah.Sanchez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Sarah.Sanchez@sanjoseca.gov)>, z. [angela.sato-anderson@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:angela.sato-anderson@sanjoseca.gov) <[angela.sato-anderson@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:angela.sato-anderson@sanjoseca.gov)>, Civic Center TV. <[civiccentertv26@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:civiccentertv26@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Pam Foley <[pam.foley@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:pam.foley@sanjoseca.gov)>, cl.d6. Devora. Davis <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, Housing.dept.maria.malloy <[maria.malloy@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:maria.malloy@sanjoseca.gov)>, OES.Cay Mackenzie <[cay.mackenzie@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:cay.mackenzie@sanjoseca.gov)>, OES.Office of Emergency Services <[oes@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:oes@sanjoseca.gov)>, OES.Jay McAmis <[Jay.mcamis@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jay.mcamis@sanjoseca.gov)>, OES Director.Ray Riordan <[ray.riordan@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:ray.riordan@sanjoseca.gov)>, sjpd. Veronica Morales <[veronica.morales@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:veronica.morales@sanjoseca.gov)>, police ofc. Monique Villarreal <[monique.villarreal@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:monique.villarreal@sanjoseca.gov)>, city clerk. RaOG Committee <[rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov)>, Hsg.dept. IT-Robert Lopez <[Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov)>, Aitken, John <[REDACTED]> d3.aide-David Tran <[David.Tran@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:David.Tran@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED]. Angel Rios <[Angel.Rios@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Angel.Rios@sanjoseca.gov)>, C. Innovation Rob Lloyd <[rob.lloyd@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rob.lloyd@sanjoseca.gov)>, DoTsi.Tree Arborist <[arborist@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:arborist@sanjoseca.gov)>, C.DoT. v. zero. Vu Dao <[vu.dao@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:vu.dao@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Fire Dept. Robert Sapien <[robert.sapien@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:robert.sapien@sanjoseca.gov)>, SJCE. Lori Mitchell <[l.mitchell@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:l.mitchell@sanjoseca.gov)>, z. Lan Diep <[contact@lanforsanjose.com](mailto:contact@lanforsanjose.com)>, c. [REDACTED]. Richard Doyle <[richard.doyle@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:richard.doyle@sanjoseca.gov)>, c. [REDACTED] Shasta Green <[shasta.greene@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:shasta.greene@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] David Cohen <[david.cohen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:david.cohen@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED]. Stacy Brown <[stacey.brown@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:stacey.brown@sanjoseca.gov)>, d5.staff. Frances Herbert <[frances.herbert@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:frances.herbert@sanjoseca.gov)>, Parks&Rec. J. Cicirelli <[john.cicirelli@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:john.cicirelli@sanjoseca.gov)>, Pblc.Wrks. Matt Cano <[matt.cano@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:matt.cano@sanjoseca.gov)>, PbWrks.sj. Silvia Bustamante <[silvia.bustamante@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:silvia.bustamante@sanjoseca.gov)>, c.airport. J.Aitken <[john.aitken@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:john.aitken@sanjoseca.gov)>, IPA. Shivaun Nurre <[shivaun.nurre@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:shivaun.nurre@sanjoseca.gov)>, C. Innovation. Brdbnd <[broadband@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:broadband@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Matt Mahan <[matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov)>, city airport. <[REDACTED]> c. attorney Nora Frimann <[n.frimann@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:n.frimann@sanjoseca.gov)>, d6.staff. Louansee Moua <[Louansee.Moua@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Louansee.Moua@sanjoseca.gov)>, c clerk. sj. <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, SAAG-Lori Severino <[Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov)>, cl.d1. Charles "Chappie" Jones <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, Ec.Dvlpt.Blage Zelalich.asst.c.mgr. <[blage.zelalich@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:blage.zelalich@sanjoseca.gov)>, C. Innovation. Dolan Beckel <[dolan.beckel@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:dolan.beckel@sanjoseca.gov)>, c.mgr.sj.office. Kathy Tsukamoto <[kathy.tsukamoto@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:kathy.tsukamoto@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Kerrie Romanow <[Kerrie.Romanow@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Kerrie.Romanow@sanjoseca.gov)>, Mayor Sam Licarrdo <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>, Path. Megan Colvard <[REDACTED]> Maya Esparza <[maya.esparza@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:maya.esparza@sanjoseca.gov)>, Plng.Dir. Rosalynn Hughey <[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)>, d1.sj. aide-David Gomez <[David.Gomez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:David.Gomez@sanjoseca.gov)>, Lib. Jill Bourne <[REDACTED]> sjpd Lt. Ellen. Washburn <[ellen.washburn@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:ellen.washburn@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED]. Qiaojie Wu <[qiaojie.wu@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:qiaojie.wu@sanjoseca.gov)>, Ec.Dvlpt.Nanci Klein <[nanci.klein@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:nanci.klein@sanjoseca.gov)>, C.Innvtn.Mgr. Kip Harkness <[kip.harkness@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:kip.harkness@sanjoseca.gov)>,

d5.aide.sj.-Omar Torres <[omar.torres@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:omar.torres@sanjoseca.gov)>, C. Innovation. Mike Jones <[mike.jones@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mike.jones@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Zulma Maciel <[Zulma.Maciel@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Zulma.Maciel@sanjoseca.gov)>, Myr. sj.staff. Paul Pereira <[Paul.Pereira@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Paul.Pereira@sanjoseca.gov)>, sjpd. Sandra Avila <[sandra.avila@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sandra.avila@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Jim Ortbal <[jim.ortbal@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:jim.ortbal@sanjoseca.gov)>, Path. Sergei <[REDACTED]> z. sjpd. David Knopf <[CHRISTOPHER.KNOPF@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:CHRISTOPHER.KNOPF@sanjoseca.gov)>, Housing.dept. Rachel VanderVeen <[Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> c.mgr.office. Stephanie Jayne <[stephanie.jayne@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:stephanie.jayne@sanjoseca.gov)>, C. Clerk-si. Toni Taber <[toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov)>, J  ssica Dickison Goodman <[REDACTED]> Planning. <[PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov)>, C.Innvtn. Sarah Papazoglakis <[Sarah.Papzolakis@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Sarah.Papzolakis@sanjoseca.gov)>, C.Innvtn. Abby Shull <[Abigail.Shull@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Abigail.Shull@sanjoseca.gov)>, cDoT. Peter Bennett <[peter.bennett@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:peter.bennett@sanjoseca.gov)>, cl.d3. Raul Peralez <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, Housing.dept. Jacky Morales-Ferrand <[Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED]. Lee Wilcox <[Lee.Wilcox@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Lee.Wilcox@sanjoseca.gov)>, c.mgr.Jennifer Maguire <[Jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov)>, cl.d5. Magdalena Carrasco <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, AgendaDesk.sj. <[agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov)>, Path. Ilene G. <[REDACTED]> Sylvia Arenas <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, [mario.maciel@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mario.maciel@sanjoseca.gov), sj.Aziza Amiri.Measure T.c.mgr. <[aziza.amiri@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:aziza.amiri@sanjoseca.gov)>, PRNS. Linda Beltran <[linda.beltran@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:linda.beltran@sanjoseca.gov)>, Communications. Carolina Camarena <[REDACTED]>, Communication <[CMOCommunications@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:CMOCommunications@sanjoseca.gov)>, [REDACTED] Joe Rois <[Joe.Rois@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Joe.Rois@sanjoseca.gov)>, Hansen, Russell <[Russell.Hansen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Russell.Hansen@sanjoseca.gov)>, C.Mgr.sj.staff. Sandy Cranford <[Sandy.Cranford@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Sandy.Cranford@sanjoseca.gov)>, c.mgr.CCEC. Elise Doan <[elise.doan@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:elise.doan@sanjoseca.gov)>, CatalyzeSV. Alex Shoor <[REDACTED]> cstaff Gina Espejo. <[gina.espejo@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:gina.espejo@sanjoseca.gov)>, SAAG. Dave. PlantToPlace. <[REDACTED]> SJCE. Zachary Struyk <[zach.struyk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:zach.struyk@sanjoseca.gov)>, Eric Schoennauer <[REDACTED]> SJ Flea Market <[REDACTED]> Spur.Fred Buzo <[REDACTED]> Bena Chang <[Bena.Chang@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Bena.Chang@sanjoseca.gov)>, SURJ <[REDACTED]> [CharterReview@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:CharterReview@sanjoseca.gov)

SCCo.D5.supvJoseph Simitian. . <[REDACTED]>

c.SCCo.D4.Supv.Susan Ellenberg. <[REDACTED]>

c..SCCo.D3.supv.Otto Lee. <[REDACTED]>

D2. S.C.Co.Brd.Supv- Cindy Chavez <[REDACTED]>

D1. SC.Co.Supv-Mike Wasserman. <[REDACTED]>

VTa Board Secretary <[REDACTED]>

Matt King <[REDACTED]> Victor Sin <[REDACTED]> Roxana Marachi <[REDACTED]>  
Somos Mayfair-C.Fontanilla <[REDACTED]> Paul Soto <[REDACTED]> tessa  
woodmansee <[REDACTED]> Somos Mayfair <[REDACTED]> Somos Mayfair <[REDACTED]>  
Sandy Perry <[REDACTED]> Robert Aguirre <[REDACTED]>  
Dennis Upton <[REDACTED]> Sameena Usman <[REDACTED]>

9/30/21, 8:43 AM

Mail - Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas - Outlook

<[REDACTED] William Armaline <[REDACTED] gail osmer  
<[REDACTED] SURJ <[REDACTED] Katherine  
Bock <[REDACTED] Michele Mashburn <[REDACTED]  
[MarHCDCMR@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:MarHCDCMR@sanjoseca.gov)  
[REDACTED]

.  
wpusa-Bob Brownstein <[REDACTED]  
Silicon Valley Transit Users <[REDACTED]  
Turnout For Transit. <[REDACTED]

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



## YOU can end the housing crisis! - Public Comment

Research1 <[REDACTED]>

Fri 9/24/2021 1:17 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

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

[External Email]

## YOU can end the housing crisis! - Public Comment

### INVESTIGATING THE CULPRITS

The housing crisis has been created by special interest groups including: 1.) Big corporate real estate broker lobbyists (Sotheby, Better Homes Realty, CBRE, Coldwell Banker, etc.) ; 2.) big corporate developers (K&B, Pulte, Blackrock, Vanguard, Berkshire Hathaway, etc.); 3.) NIMBY's and 4.) certain exclusionist tech billionaires want to NEVER allow affordable housing and affordable pre-fab builders to exist. Almost every politician, especially county planning staff, are paid bribes by real estate broker lobbies and big corporate developers. Tracking the stock market assets of the politicians and their families clearly shows the bribes.

We used FBI, CIA, FINCEN-type AI-based forensic tracking software and looked at the heads of all of the housing agencies and housing decision "research" groups, particularly in California and New York State. 98% of those people do not make the majority of their money from their salaries, THEY MAKE IT FROM INSIDER STOCK MARKET PERKS and special gifts tied back to the special interests. Why are the real FBI not arresting them? You will have to ask The Director of the FBI that question. You can talk to the folks that run the sites at: ( <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.pogo.org%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=7edMsR2b0ssNRASkTaViArqfq2%2Bv1XEpGwZyuPWjig%3D&reserved=0> ), ( <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.sunlightfoundation.com%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=77fZO9FZj8D%2Bil5XmG2LYLft%2FKFUNkmTQn2VRgc7NCU%3D&reserved=0> ), ( <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Ffollowthemoney.org%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=77fZO9FZj8D%2Bil5XmG2LYLft%2FKFUNkmTQn2VRgc7NCU%3D&reserved=0> )



[seca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=x0dg7JHNBtp6EVyUdefQbDP1su63W0kY3EwCfBs2sik%3D&reserved=0](http://seca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=x0dg7JHNBtp6EVyUdefQbDP1su63W0kY3EwCfBs2sik%3D&reserved=0) ),

(<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Ficij.org%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=pecUGDlt%2BnaKv4bXvzEUKWuuEMeYZ7jpLtb7T41Wbcs%3D&reserved=0> ), and thousands of other investigative groups and

prove it for yourself! Why is the public not demanding that stock market ownership by politicians and their families be made illegal? Because Goldman Sachs controls public policy more than you do?

In other words, the politicians that are supposed to be helping you are accepting bribes to hurt you!

### EASY SOLUTIONS TO THE CRISIS ARE BEING BLOCKADED

In San Mateo County, the housing agency does even fill out the forms to apply to the State for housing funds any more. Even though, in 2021, the State has nearly \$100B to give away to housing, San Mateo has so many rich oligarchs living there that poor and middle class housing is too much of a bother for them.

Dwell Magazine-type modern low-cost prefab homes, CREATED in California, are blockaded by these special interest groups. Clayton Homes, BluHomes (now killed off by special interests), Factory OS, Homes Direct and hundreds of other California companies make off-site manufactured homes that are nicer looking, 50% lower cost, safer, faster to erect, more energy efficient and better than site-built homes. The real estate and union lobbies have gotten them banned in most counties because they are jealous of them. Powerful anti-trust law violating real estate and union lobbies got the zoning codes changed to make off-site manufactured homes hard to get permits for. If you want the best home at the best price, sue your county to demand home equality and construction-justice.

Ensuring that our County has sufficient affordable housing for its residents is an urgent challenge. Off-site construction serves as the most promising tool to reduce costs and increase supply, but one whose full potential cannot be realized or optimized without thoughtful and intentional changes in the policy, process, and programs that support affordable housing in the County.

Across all stakeholder groups, you always found a shared desire and passion to address the monumental housing shortage, as well as a collective understanding of the collaboration needed to make modular one part of the solution. As one interviewee put it: "Everyone wants everyone else to succeed."

While modular may not be a panacea, nor the only innovation needed, the County must take advantage of this opportunity to catalyze innovation in off-site construction methods and remove unnecessary anti-trust-violating barriers to its adoption created by special interest groups.

Many counties just pay lip-service, window-dressing, pretend-we-are-doing-something time to housing because their officials are paid by big business lobbies who HATE affordable housing because it competes with them.

Over a million Californians get \$1500.00 from HUD Section 8 and related programs but they are blockaded by lobbying from these special interest groups from using those funds to buy a home. The HUD Section 8 Home Ownership program in California is a sham. Nobody can find the paperwork, get the help or get the counties to pay attention when they apply.

So there is this massively financed army of mega-powerful anti-housing people who have huge law firms working to stop all of your good deeds and manipulate all of your politicians and social service agencies.

#### HOW TO WIN THE BATTLE

As California enters what Sacramento calls: "the worst housing crisis in 100 years!", one must look at the big picture. The U.S. housing market is 4 million single-family homes short of what is needed to meet the country's demand, according to a new analysis by mortgage-finance company Freddie Mac. The estimate represents a 52% rise in the nation's home shortage compared with 2018, the first time Freddie Mac quantified the shortfall because states like California have made home-building practically a crime.

Thousands of modern Dwell magazine-type pre-fab home suppliers can deliver amazing modern homes for around \$150K but they are stonewalled, delayed and forced to double or triple those costs because of anti-building rules promoted by California and now mirrored nationally by greedy politicians. Greedy politicians take bribes from real estate lobbies and big developer corporations who HATE affordable homes because they don't make much profit on them.

One approach is to break-up and sue ALL of the real estate broker lobbies and big development corporations. You can sue them and their political lap dogs under RICO and anti-trust laws. Politicians receive bribes from the anti-housing bad guys as: cash, search engine rigging, hookers, dinners and via hundreds of other forms of payola and stock market trades. You would think that using legal tactic to take them all down would be a slam dunk. It isn't. Those politicians control whether

or not those legal actions can get launched. So you have to be very creative to counter-measure them. For example, you can shame them into submission using the internet's mass media technologies.

Farmers and Colleges, especially, have tons of extra land. Farmers are losing money on agriculture and could make far more money selling their land for housing. Stanford University is in so much trouble for bribery, sex abuse, mysogyny, politics and other scandals that the State can justify taking back the Stanford campus to build housing on.

If the State of California was serious about solving the housing crisis it would support a SIMPLE program for the hundreds of thousands of renters, who get \$1600.00 a month, forever, from HUD for tiny rental apartments, to EASILY use that money for mortgage to build, or buy, a small home.

By law, there is SUPPOSED to be such a program: The HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program, is supposed to allow this to happen, but it is shadow-banned across the state. Most county officials don't even know how it works or direct inquiries to dead-ends. The HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program must be easier to get into, easier to find out about and no longer HIDDEN by County officials.

Don't believe it? Do a test yourself. Call the Housing agency office in each of California's 58 counties. When someone pick's up the phone say: "I am HUD-qualified for the HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program. I would like to use the program to buy or build a home in your county. What do I need to do to complete the process?". Then experience a hell beyond anything you can imagine. You won't get in, most likely, and it won't be your fault.

You will be kept out. This is a federal law. It is your right to use this law. If you already get HUD money to underwrite your rent, you are per-qualified to use this program. Santa Cruz, Marin, San Francisco and other snooty counties will try to stop you because using it means you might not be white enough for their vision of high tax revenue home owners. You might be a deplorable if you use your federal \$1500.00 for an actual home. The average mortgage payment in America is \$940.00 per month to own a home. HUD pays an average of \$1500.00 per month to your landlord. Do the math! These people will build free home inventory for California, die, and leave that inventory in California. Why won't California help them to help solve California's housing inventory crisis?

A person building their own home is going to make sure it is done right if they are going to live in it. Build-your-own-home singular home-builders can contribute to the home inventory problem faster and more cost-effectively.

Marcia Fudge at HUD said the Biden administration plans to level the

playing field for Americans who want to buy a home by providing down payment assistance for people to move from public housing to homeownership. "We will make sure those who can afford a mortgage are put in a position to be able to buy a home," Fudge said. "Right now we have banks who don't want to lend to people to buy a home for less than \$50,000" — homes, she said, that "poor people" can afford, with monthly mortgage payments often lower than rent.

## THE FAKE INFLATED COST OF A HOME

San Francisco built brand new homes across from the Police HQ in San Francisco and these small prefab units ended up costing hundreds of thousands of dollars per unit: They cost twice as much as the same unit in Austin, Texas would cost to build. Why are cities spending the same per apartment for homeless people that you can build a 1600 sq. ft. stand-alone single family modular home for!!!! The answer is: Cronyism. They could have cost much less but the process tripled their cost in California.

California spends an average of \$800,000.00 to build each "low income apartment" for low income people. That is what the government pays for each unit. If you are not aware of how much things actually cost, and you are willing to pay all of the mark-ups and inflated numbers of retail prices then your average cost to build a 2,600 sq.ft. single-family home in the U.S. ranges from \$240,000 to \$710,000, with most homeowners spending around \$423,800 for the job.

The high cost is \$1,000,000+ for a 2,600 sq.ft. custom-built home with high-end materials, three-car garage, covered deck, and landscaping. That million dollar+ price is for the yuppie people who pay \$150.00 per month for the same tv channels that smart people get for \$10.00 per month. BUT!...The build-it-yourself cost for this is \$140,000 for a 2,600 sq.ft. builder-grade home with no changes. Every time you change even the tiniest thing in your construction plan, add \$10,000.00, or more, to your cost.

Most people only ACTUALLY need a 1,200 sq. ft. home but they can't let go of the "mine-is-bigger-than-yours" syndrome. That build-it-yourself modular/prefab home at 1,200 sq. ft. can be under \$100,000.00 if you are an EDUCATED general supervising contractor who hires a licensed, top-references, electrician, carpenter and plumber to build it with them. If you build-it-yourself without hiring those seasoned specialists, your project will usually fail. Homes only cost a million dollars if you are a sucker.

2 bedroom stand-alone homes can be built for \$100,000.00 in costs. Realtors, builders, developers and politicians will LIE all day long to keep this fact from being exposed. The bribes, mark-ups, payola, padding, profiteering, etc. make that same house cost \$1.2M on the

market. For example, see: <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Ffruralstudio.org%2Fproject%2F2020-20k-home%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wljAwMDAiLCJQljoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2BU7et5lx8bx6KPSF5NSn4qKFc9D2a7mE%2Bi70iv2%2BPG4%3D&reserved=0>

In Santa Rosa California, it cost the County \$268,000.00 to build a single seat public toilet. In Alabama it costs \$268,000.00 to build a 2 bedroom house.

San Francisco City Hall found that painting and servicing a white rectangle on the ground for homeless people to put their tent in cost the City \$6000.00 per month per rectangle. That is how much a penthouse luxury apartment with multiple bathrooms costs in Austin, Texas. Why is building something costing more than the thing is worth? Cronyism, kickbacks and self-dealing with buddies.

Many Housing Permit Department and City Hall people in San Francisco have been arrested, recently, but the corrupt practices and bribery continues without pause. Bribery of public officials often doubles the cost of a home.

#### ENCAMPED HOMELESS PEOPLE DON'T WANT YOUR HELP

Even more interesting: San Francisco took over luxury hotels and offered them to the homeless but 70% of the homeless refused to use the free housing. 70% of the homeless refused a free home in a luxury hotel!!! Why?

The homeless people said why, and it is documented, but NOBODY IN SACRAMENTO EVER reads the statements or they hide the statements from the public.

Here is why the homeless said they don't want California's free housing:

- 1.) The rules to live in the housing are not rules they can, or will, comply with.
- 2.) Most of them are addicted to smoking, drinking and drugs and the "free units" have cameras and sensors that record them doing the illicit things. They know that and won't move into a place they know they will get arrested or evicted from as fast as they move in.
- 3.) The vast contracts and regulation documents they must agree to are something they need a lawyer to explain to them and none of them have lawyers.
- 4.) Many of them use sex bartering and the cameras on the units will record sex worker activities.
- 5.) None of them want to be condensed into a tight space with other crazy people because they get set-upon by the worst of the bunch.
- 6.) They don't want multi-unit housing! They hate it. They want

individual homes where they control the whole environment. San Francisco is spending at least TWICE as much money for short term solutions as it would cost for individual pre-fab stand-alone homes.

7.) Many of them are clinically insane and won't cooperate with any form of order or "rules".

Most of all: Drug-soaked crazy people don't want any help from The State. Families, seniors and disabled people want the help from the SSA and Housing people and they are getting ignored.

ALL homeless people should receive a free mental health evaluation and free therapy until their issues are resolved.

California has published a vast number of reports, at a cost of tens of millions of dollars, listing the exact number of homeless people, but California has never spent the \$60,000.00 it would cost to ask each homeless person the 10 questions about what they want! California politicians in Sacramento don't actually care what homeless people want. They care what they can scam out of a "stimulus" fund to scrape their cut off-the-top of.

#### HOUSING AGENCIES (PHA'S) AND UNIONS ARE STOPPING SOLUTIONS TO THE HOUSING CRISIS

The San Francisco construction unions and lobbies won't allow the homeless solutions that will work. All of the special interests in San Francisco, from unions, to rich people, to politicians, to realty lobbies, to you-name-it, will block anything that makes housing cheaper. They ALL make their money off of a percentage of the most expensive property values. The Realtor lobby and the big building lobby are probably the most powerful special interest groups in California, after the teachers union. They HATE affordable housing. Anything they say to the contrary is a lie. They bribe 90% of the politicians in the state via Dark Money conduits. They are NOT going to help solve this.

When you call top Housing agency officials in Santa Cruz, Marin, San Francisco, Tulare and other counties to ask them what the main reason is that poor people can't get new homes built, they all pretty much said: "The State and County laws prevent us from building anything these days..."

San Jose got it right by promising a one hour permit time-frame for ADU home construction but other counties are resisting this permit optimization effort because permits are where bribes happen!

Factory OS, Clayton Homes, Homes Direct, and an army of other factory built home companies, have offered homes to Californians for \$150,000.00, or less, if the State will just fix the permit process and give them a pre-order of 200 homes at a time. Banks will finance these...if the State of California will help bundle land and



construction financing in the same package.

Marin County staff said: "We have enough open, empty fields in the county to house every single homeless person in the State but we can't get anything built here without a ton of lawsuits, 5 year studies and permit hell-scapes. Every homeless person could get a modern Dwell Magazine-style stand-alone small house if the County Office's didn't block every single construction project that is attempted!"

The difference between what California says, and does, is the same difference between night and day. San Francisco is an example of how home-building has been halted in the State. The rest of the state is following the profiteering based blockades to keep homes from getting built to deliver permanent supportive rental housing for people living with a serious mental illness who are homeless, chronically homeless, or at-risk of chronic homelessness. The government funds are rarely ACTUALLY used to acquire, design, construct, rehabilitate, or preserve permanent supportive housing, which may rarely include a capitalized operating subsidy reserve.

OK, so say you don't care about the homeless people. "Screw em all" you say. "They are low life drug users and weirdos who won't confirm to our white picket fence social programming..."

If you care about getting a home for yourself, you have the same problems.

Want to buy a home or buy a bigger home? Forget it, you are screwed if you live in California. The State has, essentially, "outlawed" construction.

You can't build a home without the process being so painful, expensive, delayed and litigation-focused that it will ruin your life.

If the State of California was serious about solving the housing crisis it would create a single two to three page building permit application, that worked in every County, that a single state office could sign off on within 48 to 60 hours.

If the State of California was serious about solving the housing crisis they would change the zoning codes. Nobody can build in California without being punished for it by California and County regulations.

If the State of California was serious about solving the housing crisis they would turn the tsunami of state-created immigrant unemployment into a positive, Now that California has let half of Mexico in to the State, you have huge clusters of skilled workers hanging around, looking for work, a few blocks away from every Home Depot in the State. Each 20 of them can erect a move-in ready home in one week. Give them an empty pasture and a challenge and turn them loose with a pay-per-house incentive payment structure.



All of the programs listed at:

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.hcd.ca.gov%2Fgrants-funding%2Factive-funding%2Findex.shtml&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wljAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=DBOeEf9pUgSf%2BotzXyTe4lUrXAqp3%2Fgh3pjleVvaY%3D&reserved=0> need

TRIPLE the amount of funds currently allocated and they need to be moved into no less than 3 main programs. The current MASSIVE number of programs guarantees that corruption, duplication, and transparency inefficiency are at a maximum worst-case level. In all of these programs there is nothing for the individual. Almost all of the plans are based on the "Shove-them-all-in-a-big-concrete-building" concept. The public does not want that. NOBODY wants to live in, or see, multi-unit housing. The State needs to also TRIPLE the amount of programs for the SINGLE FAMILY or INDIVIDUAL. County Housing agencies have been found to be corrupt and motivated by bribes. If the State of California was serious about solving the housing crisis it would put a billion dollars of it's freebie COVID CASH from Washington, DC into it's CalHOME fund and restart that fund.

On Broadway and Divisadero streets in San Francisco, giant mansions house two to four people. Those structures, without changing the outside of the buildings one tiny bit, can house hundreds of people. NIMBY's biggest complaint is based on appearance. If you change the inside of structures and keep the outside looking "classic", you get the least amount of NIMBY issues. San Francisco already has ALL of the fully constructed square footage to solve ALL of it's housing issues, if it works from the inside out. Empty office buildings and dead millionaire mansions can deliver the square footage.

Gavin Newsom based his election on providing millions of new homes to California. Nobody has been able to find a single one of these new houses he said he was going to build.

THE BIGGEST TAKE-AWAY: "NOBODY wants to live in a multi-unit concrete building block. Multi-unit project buildings harm people's mental state and create conflict, house gangs and they are bad socially. There is enough empty land for everyone in California to have a 1600 sq. ft. home of their own. Change the rules so that more people at below \$100K income levels can buy or build a home and the public will solve the housing crisis.

Until those kinds of things happen, there is no hope for the State! Greed, payola, special interests and revolving door jobs control your housing opportunities in the state of California. California State has every tool, resource and dollar it already needs to solve every single housing issue in the State except one think: "Courage". It take courage

to say "No" to the special interests. It takes courage to say "No to the Silicon Valley billionaires. It takes courage to cut off the spigot of Congressional bribes. Most of the federal cash that comes to California always ends up in a politicians, or their friend's pockets. It takes courage to say that every Californian that invested their lives in California deserves the home in California that they were promised. Fix the HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program in California. Make an office in every major city that ONLY helps people with the HUD Section 8 Home "Ownership" Program and not just the Section 8 "rental" program.

ALL OF THE MONEY needed to fund that is already paid out in California, by HUD, EVERY MONTH! Give citizens their promised right to build and own a home!

The State of California and HUD housing agencies have long lists of "Certified", "Qualified", "Approved", etc. loan brokers and mortgage brokers that the agencies say will help low-income citizens get single family financing.

So we called everybody on one of those lists provided by the State of California.

In fact, those loan brokers and mortgage companies don't want to hear from you unless you are in a bid war on a \$1.5 million dollar bungalow for which you already have \$500K, or more, in cash in the bank.

Only a small percentage of the loan brokers and mortgage brokers on those lists had EVER done a completed subsidized home loan and even less had any clue how to paper a HUD Home Ownership financed home loan. Over 20 U.S. Bank mortgage brokers even refused to respond to emails or phone calls if one used the words "Cal-FHA USDA" because, as one unusually talkative U.S. Bank employee stated: "To us, those are code-words for 'poor people', the market is, frankly, too hot for banks to bother with the poors because we don't make any money off them".

It does not matter if you have spent years trying to keep your FICO score above 700. It does not matter that you never had a bankruptcy. It does not matter that you have guaranteed income for life from your government benefits. All of those things that the media told you to do to be a "good citizen" with a good social credit score seem to be pointless.

The loan and mortgage brokers on those lists are only on those lists to get a few PR brownie points. They do not want to hear from you or deal with you unless you are making big bucks in tech. They will let you upload your information but they will do little or nothing to help you because they lose money by helping you. They only make money off of the big deals.

On top of that the big real estate developers like Pulte Homes,

Berkshire Hathaway (Warren Buffet), Kauffman and Broad (K&B Homes), etc. are bribing the Governor and the heads of all of the agencies to keep you from building a home or getting a home that is not in one of their giant developments.

Most low-income people are the laborers who build the homes in those big real estate developments. Those people know how to build their own homes but State and Federal agency heads are bribed to make sure you NEVER can build your own home. Those people know they can build an incredible home, on their own, for under \$100,000.00. You can see thousands of videos on the internet showing people that do it every day in any state but California. Try to build a home in California. You will find you are blockaded at every turn EXCLUSIVELY by rules that you have to follow but that big developers do not!

Try to buy a modular or factory build home in California ...Same thing.

The political bosses in California have taken so many bribes from big special interests that they can't stop sucking on the graft hose.

Political Bribes By Special Interest Lobbyists Make California Uninhabitable

If the state and federal government were actually serious about solving the housing crisis, they would have a mortgage agency that only serviced subsidized housing!

Low income people: "approved" lenders and mortgage brokers hate you and don't want you bothering them.

US BANK, Wells Fargo, Guild Mortgage, and all the rest, talk a good story when they are on-camera or doing a public presentation but the reality is that they consider you to be a "waste of their time" if you are needing subsidized housing. They all issue press releases where they talk about their "commitments" and "special programs" but they put zero effort into those green-washing intentions. They only say those things to keep the banking regulators off their backs and to make their favorite politicians happy.

When real estate developers are paying politicians and banks to ignore low-income people and 79% of America is now "low income", with more arriving daily, what chance does the public have?

The trend is edging toward disaster.

## What's REALLY behind the war on home ownership?

The incipient "Great Reset" is a multi-faceted beast. We talk a lot about vaccine passports and lockdowns and the Covid-related aspects – and we should – but there's more to it than that.

Remember, they want you to "own nothing and be happy". And right at the top of the list of things you definitely shouldn't own, is your own home.

The headlines about this have been steady for the last few years, but it has picked up pace in the wake of the "pandemic" (as has so much else). An agenda hidden on back pages, behind by Covid's meaningless big red numbers, but perhaps no less sinister. You can find articles all over the net talking up renting over owning.

Last month, for example, Bloomberg ran an article headlined: America Should Become a Nation of Renters"; Which praises what they call "the liquefaction of the housing market" and gleefully expounds on the idea that "The very features that made home buying an affordable and stable investment are coming to an end."

The Atlantic published "Why Its Better To Rent Than Own" in March. Financial pages from Business Insider to Forbes to Yahoo and Bloomberg again are filled with lists titled "9 Ways Renting is Better Than Buying", or similar.

Other publications go more personal with it, with anecdotal columns about ignoring financial advice and refusing to buy your home. Vox, never one to sell their agenda with any kind of subtlety, have a piece titled: "Homeownership can bring out the worst in you" Which literally argues that buying a house can make you a bad person: "It's the biggest thing you might ever buy. And it could be turning you into a bad person."

So what exactly is the narrative here? What's the story behind the story?

The short answer is fairly simple: It's about greed, and it's about control.

It almost always is, in the end.

The longer answer is rather more complicated. Major investment firms such as Vanguard and Blackrock, along with rental companies such as American Homes 4 Rent, are buying up single-family homes in record numbers – sometimes entire neighbourhoods at a time. They pay well over market value, pricing families who want to own those homes out of the market, which forces the housing market up whilst the Lockdown-created recession is lowering wages and creating millions of newly unemployed.

Of course, this is motivating people to sell the houses they already own.

People all across America have been saddled with houses worth less than they bought them for since the 2008 economic crash, and are eager to

take the cash from private investment firms paying 10-20% over market value. Combine an economic recession with a created housing boom and you have a huge population of motivated sellers.

Of course, many of these sellers don't realise, until it's too late, that even if they attempt to downsize or move to a cheaper area, they may be priced out of the market completely, and forced to rent.

As such, in the last year, the private investment share of single-family home purchases is estimated to have increased ten-fold, going from 2% in 2018 to over 20% this year.

As more and more people are forced to rent, of course, rental properties will be in higher and higher demand. This in turn will drive the cost of renting up.

Market Watch has already reported that, in the last year, rent has increased over 3x faster than the government predicted. This problem is likely to get worse in the near future.

Congress "accidentally failed" to extend the Covid-related eviction ban.

Which means, this weekend, while Senators adjourn to the summer homes they probably don't rent, the ban will officially end and a lot of people are likely to have their houses foreclosed or their landlords kick them out.

The newly empty buildings will be a feeding frenzy for the massive corporate landlords. Who will descend on the banks like starving hyenas to snap up the foreclosed properties for pennies on the dollar. Just like they did in 2008.

None of this is any secret, it's been covered in the mainstream. Tucker Carlson even did a segment on it in early June.

The Wall Street Journal headlined, back in April, "If You Sell a House These Days, the Buyer Might Be a Pension Fund", and reported: Yield-chasing investors are snapping up single-family homes, competing with ordinary Americans and driving up prices. However, since then, something has clearly changed. The propaganda machine has kicked into gear to defend Wall Street from any backlash.

No better example of this shift can be found than The Atlantic, which ran this story in 2019: WHEN WALL STREET IS YOUR LANDLORD. With help from the federal government, institutional investors became major players in the rental market. They promised to return profits to their investors and convenience to their tenants. Investors are happy. Tenants are not.

...and this story last month: BLACKROCK IS NOT RUINING THE US HOUSING

MARKET, The real villain isn't a faceless Wall Street Goliath; it's your neighbors and local governments stopping the construction of new units.

Going back to the Vox well we have: "Wall Street isn't to blame for the chaotic housing market" Which ran just a few days after the Atlantic article, and is practically identical.

Both these (oddly similar) articles argue that Wall Street and private equity firms can't be blamed for buying up houses, and that the real problem is the lack of supply to meet demand.

You see, all the "selfish" people who already own homes (they did say it makes you a bad person) are blocking the construction of new houses, and thus driving up the cost of property through scarcity.

This has been a logically flawed argument around the housing market for decades.

That there aren't enough houses for people to buy is patently absurd when the US census data says that there are over 15 million houses currently standing empty. That's enough to house all of America's roughly 500,000 homeless people 30x over. There's plenty of houses, there's just not enough money to buy them.

The reason for that is the same reason the California has massive "homeless camps" in its major cities, and that so many people are having to become renters instead of owners: wage stagnation.

For decades now, wage increases have lagged behind increases in the cost of living. In the 1960s one full-time job could afford a decent standard of living for a family of four or more. These days both parents work, sometimes multiple jobs each.

It was huge amounts of financial de-regulation which created this situation. So, whether you believe Vox's BlackRock apologia or not, one way or another Wall Street very definitely is to blame.

But this isn't just about money. It never is. Just as the war on cash isn't just about efficiency, and the environmental push isn't just about climate change. Ditto veganism. It's about control. Just like vaccines, lockdowns and masks.

It always comes down to control.

It's an oft-used cliché, but no less true for that, that homeownership "gives people a stake in society". A family-owned house is a source of security for the future and something to leave your children. It is also sovereignty and privacy. Your own space that no one else can control or take away.

In short: A homeowner is independent. A renter is not. A renter can be controlled. A homeowner can not.

It's the same reasoning behind the way working people were encouraged to take out loans and become debt slaves. If you limit people's options, if you make them rely on you for a roof over their heads, you have control over them.

There's a great article about this situation called "Your New Feudal Overlords".

Under Feudalism, land wasn't owned by the working class, but provided to them by landed barons, hence the term "Land Lord". If you disrespected your Lord, or broke his rules, or he perceived another peasant/farm animal/crop would be a better use of the land, he could take it back.

Essentially, the behaviour of serfs was kept in check by their reliance on the nobility for a place to live. That's very much the dynamic they're going for here.

Rental agreements can be full of any terms and conditions the landlord wants, and the more desperate people get the more of their consumer rights they will sign over.

Maybe you'll agree to smart meters which monitor your internet or power-usage habits, and then sell the data to behavioural modellers and viral marketers.

Maybe you'll have to agree to certain power limitations or water shortages in order to "fight climate change".  
Maybe it will get worse than that.

Maybe they'll go full Black Mirror style corporate dystopia. Maybe, through affiliation programs, the mega-equity firm which owns your rental house has ties to McDonald's, and as such will require you to not eat at any competing fast-food franchises, or demand you observe at least ninety seconds of Disney advertisements per day.

Maybe it will be as simple as including vaccine status in the tenancy agreement, making it impossible for the unvaxxed to find a home.

Maybe they just want to make poor people miserable.

After all, the super-wealthy have got all the money they could ever need, and all the luxury they could ever use. Their living standards are as high as physically possible. So maybe the only way they can keep "winning", is to start driving the living standards of us proles down.



No air travel. No vacations. No going out at all. Live in a tiny house, or a pod. Eat bugs. Get rid of your car. Rent your clothes. Or your furniture. Pay taxes on sugar. And alcohol. And red meat.

They've been very clear about this. They've told you about the Great Reset and the Internet of Things. That's the plan. You won't own a house. And you'll be happy...or else the mega-corporation you're forced to rent from will kick you out.

The lenders said that Wall Street Conglomerates and investment corporations are coming in right behind the fires and buying up all the fixer uppers and chunks of homes so that individuals can't get them. The contractors that made money flipping homes are saying they can't get enough fixer uppers any more. The lenders also said that "the lenders market is only looking at these \$1.5M home deals where people are overbidding \$200K or more". There are two conglomerates that already have people on the ground in South Lake Tahoe and Southern Oakland making cash offers for properties, US Bank told us. We can build a nice house for about \$100K. We have done such nice ones in the past that they were on TV. Access to housing in the county is being limited by the conglomerates and banks and the push by lenders to keep the over-priced housing market going for as long as possible. Alameda County and All East Bay counties should make these people buy houses for low income and seniors since they are stealing all of the homes in the area:

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fnypost.com%2F2020%2F07%2F18%2Fcorporations-are-buying-houses-robbing-families-of-american-dream%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=ma3lc3tpEwoC%2Bck5DD3el4Qs12BX3lifVGeEg2yVstQ%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.nytimes.com%2F2020%2F03%2F04%2Fmagazine%2Fwall-street-landlords.html&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=6fEL158FO1n7n2pCheX1qgbi6VT4YtJDOi3nyrPmM0s%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theatlantic.com%2Ftechnology%2Farchive%2F2019%2F02%2Fsingle-family-landlords-wall-street%2F582394%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259669186%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=MRUiJm%2BW0AXwJWgrsFs1vJavjp2Plx78rzP53Hr8xH0%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wsj.com%2Farticles%2Fwall-street-cant-get-enough-fixer-upper-houses-11631007001&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=euFqkd%2Bxhe3ITCTq5bJ0uDCXnlytuZ6vu2dkAGvQs9l%3D&reserved=0>

#### Public Comments from Readers:

- This is an excellent article which should be blatantly obvious to all by now: Blackstone/BlackRock and the CCP are the major real estate owners — this is the culmination of the 50-year long Rockefeller Plan, hatched by the meetings of Rockefeller and Mao and Zhou when Nixon and Kissinger, David Rockefeller's minions, flew to Beijing with Rockefeller aboard Air Force One!

Blackstone Group — founded with Rockefeller seed money by DR's minion, Peter G. Peterson — owned 30% of BlackRock which was spun off from the Blackstone Group — who knows what their ownership is today?! In the 1970s Rockefeller and the Chicoms created the Rigged Market of Rigged Markets — the control of capital/labor between these two economies, establishing them as the top 2 economies 50 years later — eventually merging Wall Street and the CCP, which is exactly what happened! IT IS ALL ABOUT the ultra-concentration of ownership — welcome to the Global Neofeudalist State.

- Vanguard (privately owned) owns most shares of Blackrock as well as most of the other main players. Vanguard sits at the top of the pyramid of power and money and is THE big monopolist in this world. See this video

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.bitchute.com%2Fvideo%2FQdbvR9Wn5HFU%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=Zb9u3fmgrQ9%2FctSJNZaanHoWaaXGJWN7kvyXENKY0Qg%3D&reserved=0>

- If you don't own real property, your economic security and independence is weakened. For the last 20 years I've owned at least 2 places to live just for extra safety. At this time I have 3. But then I've been a real estate investor for almost 50 years.

- Good analysis. Effectively, the US Constitution was Revolutionary because it made a statement that Individual Rights were going to be protected for everyone. In these Rights is understood the right to own, a key feature of real capitalism. But when we can't make the difference anymore between Major Corporations and Government, and these mega

corporations get into a complicit scheme to own everything...our individual rights dissipate. Prior to the US revolution, Individual Rights were closely correlated with social status which is closely related to economic status. You just need to read the Plea

(<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcraigwright.net%2Fblog%2Fbitcoin-blockchain-tech%2Fsatoshi-and-the-sophists%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQljojV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&psdata=s3hE3xRTlhX1MJNHkLb5WRICozSjQCNjY%2F4a527OMjs%3D&reserved=0>)

Mega elitists such as Craig Steven Wright, the fake Satoshi Nakamoto and pretend Bitcoin creator, to understand to core of the Big Post Covid Reset...it's running back to your life being a Privilege distributed by the State. In English, 2 words describe the core of our rights: Freedom and Liberty. One carries a exogenous dimension (Liberty), the other an Endogenous one (Freedom). In the French language, there is no such nuance. And Liberty and Freedom are only Liberté And it their dictum "Liberté Égalité Fraternité", an Individual Rights incompetency arise. Because with these 3 words persists the idea that we are foremost a community before being Individuals, in line with a Matriarchal concept, but the Antitheses of the American Original vision. Is it surprising that Sarkozy promulgated laws which made it so that even in your House, what you say may be held against you. In France, if more than 3 persons in a house are talking, and that one is not a direct member of the family in the first degree, any hate speech articulated may send you in prison and get you a fine...No sanctity in the Household, even if you are the owner.

- Manfred Max-Neef, the late "Barefoot Economist" from Chile, who lectured at UC Berkeley, said 5 or 10 years ago that USAmerica was the 1st "Undeveloping Nation" and cited formerly affluent homeowners living in vans at the curbside of their foreclosed mansions. An analogue to this, for "dot" collectors, is what Alan Watts called over 50 years ago "the Los Angelization of the world" (himself an L. A. resident, and as a bonus fun fact, interviewed my old man, a profoundly corporatist lawyer — ecjlaw.com — for his services, in 1969, and declined them, despite an intro from his friend Laura Huxley). Both the LosAngelization of the World and Undevelopment are sorry symptoms of the same disease of Organized Greed, without an apparent immune system or other remedy in most societies, since Intel is busily employed with its vast armies of termites to eviscerate all these structures, many ages old. The controlled demolition of our societies and cultures goes on apace, with accelerants of salivating covetousness, institutionalized sins. I myself have always preferred the nomadic way, the street, rich with the opportunities for unconventional wisdom, such as contented any number of native peoples here in USA, before having even their tribal roots and networks here largely deracinated and decimated by "settlers". And, even more so, "developers". All as a fairly recent development into this Age

https://outlook.office365.com/mail/rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov/inbox/id/AAQkADhhYzk3NTk1LTBmZDAtdNdc4Yi1hN2Q0LTZjNmZjNTk5...

18/27

of Undevelopment. I met a guy 50 miles down the coast near the seaside in Bucanmeer Park, Oceanside, north San Diego County. We talked a long time one sunny day, he told me from the front seat of his high end Lexus luxury model how he had been living there in his car with his cat for three years, after losing his mansion with custom swimming pool. He had little street savvy and I cringed while he told me, with childlike naiveté, stories of being mistreated by all the usual suspects, health agencies, other street people, and on and on. I tried to warn him, seeing one gnarly red flag after another, but it went in one ear and out the other, from what I could tell.

- Here in the US, the CDC mandated a policy to prohibit eviction of renters for 1 year (that has just now expired). Many landlords sustained huge financial losses or bankruptcy as their renters became squatters. What this might portend for our biowarfare future is the squeezing of individual/small group rental property ownership using onerous regulation, a lack of access to financing, etc. to foster the consolidation of rental property by mega/global corporations who will seamlessly align with any and all tenets of The Great Reset.

- Do they not fear that creating a population that owns nothing, that population also have nothing to lose?

- Why doesn't anyone discuss zero to negative interest rates ? Why has this unprecedented phenomenon been pushed by the banksters ?

- In America, the government owns your home even if you pay the banksters off. Don't pay your property tax and out on the street you go.

- I've given this a lot of thought over the last dozen years. And done a lot of research too. It is one of the most important mechanisms of transforming middle-class life into out and out serfdom in America, this taking away the possibility of home ownership. First they went after the millennials, by way of impossible levels of student debt (so they couldn't buy a house), then they worked on the problem of what to do about the existing tens of millions of homeowners. Private equity entered into the picture big-time and since then has been at it relentlessly. Basically, it is not possible for any normal middle-class person to buy a home in any desirable part of the country (and increasingly even the less desirable, more remote and inaccessible parts), because you can't compete with the endless cash resources of private equity. The article is very right, and I have had the same thesis in mind for many years: homeownership provides a form of security, a political voice that comes from power, that the new feudal lords have to get rid of at any cost. And they've succeeded without any noise.

-IT IS ALL ownership —- not just home ownership! Who owns the banks? In a study of the Rockefeller Financial Group back in the early 1970s by

Prof. James Knowles (impossible to find now, although once frequently found in other book citations), Prof. Knowles wrote that the owners of the banks was a carefully guarded secret. Once upon a time we knew. Recall that the original primary investors in Intel, Apple and Microsoft was the Rockefeller family — who are the principal investors today — not the investment firms of BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street, etc., but those investing through them??? NOBODY KNOWS!

- "No property rights for private citizens" ? Why so stalinist? It's not necessary at all. They will just make us so poor, that we won't be able to own anything of relevance, everything courtesy of free market inclusive capitalism.

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fqz.com%2Fwork%2F1942727%2Fpope-francis-backs-the-council-for-inclusive-capitalism%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=qzO79DTcgzje2BkJGKPK1EhRO%2FvWahCXDXDuBE2uRIs%3D&reserved=0>

They are well on track, today this is home, in few years you won't be able to afford an electric car, carbon indulgences will impoverish us further... People will have tooth brush and clothes of their Choice. And be happy, yeaaaa

- ...Where there's \*Rent\* there are \*Rentiers\*..."The Cantillon effect..The Cantillon effect was explained by Richard Cantillon (1680s – 1734) an Irish-French economist and author of "Essai sur la Nature du Commerce en Général" (Essay on the Nature of Trade in General). In his Essay, Cantillon provided an advanced version the quantity theory of money, however he also dug deeper and perceptively into the relative inflation associated with the introduction, circulation and velocity of money. He explained that the original recipients of new money enjoy higher standards of living at the expense of later recipients. This is because of inflation in asset prices e.g. affecting house prices and rents and as a result of time lags impacted by a disproportionate relative inflation in prices of assets and goods decreasing value of money in the hands of non-asset holding individuals i.e. the majority. These concepts of relative inflation, or a differential rise in prices among different goods in an economy, is now known as the Cantillon effect. The Cantillon effect has two components. One is the impact of new money on differential inflation rates between assets and consumption items and, the other, is the real incomes and wealth effects that result in an increasing disparity in incomes and wealth within the country. Under QE this effect has been extreme because banks short-circuited money distribution largely to themselves and a reduced number of large corporate customers to deal in assets and share buy backs. It is self-evident that if rentiers maintain a growth in income that is inflation proof the state of their real income will constantly rise. However, this is not the case of the state of real incomes for an



increasing majority of the population. This Bank of England "policy" has done little to help the conditions of the working population which is becoming increasingly asset-less. This mechanism constraining asset access and accumulation by the majority is a driver of an inevitable future increasing inequality."

"The nature of asset-derived income...Thostein Veblen identified the problems we now face, back in 1921, well before the 1929 New York Stock Exchange crash, when he examined trends in financialisation and the growth in the rentier class in manufacturing and industry.

Financialization is the process whereby all economic considerations are reduced to a nominal financial quantification usually measured in the local currency or expressed in a common currency by applying exchange rates. The crucial problem with financialization is that what appear to be distinct policies or even schools of thought, such as Keynesianism or Monetarism, and supply side economics are in fact questions of emphasis on which aspect of financialization is more significant as a policy target. These are aggregate demand (expressed as a quantified monetary aggregate) or money supply (expressed as a quantified monetary aggregate). Increasingly economic activities involve so-called financial engineering where the manipulation of numbers substitutes for real production or services where income is received in return for little effort beyond the holding of some asset which generates an income from those who make use of the asset. This has created a major financial services activity that is made up of über-rentiers." ...(Emphasis mine...)

[https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.realincomes.org.uk%2Fclassdivstab.htm&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=C5kWi1mEAQShB54kksWPnp4YCIvYkLd0kz7TWo4WMLg%3D&reserved=0)

[url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.realincomes.org.uk%2Fclassdivstab.htm&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=C5kWi1mEAQShB54kksWPnp4YCIvYkLd0kz7TWo4WMLg%3D&reserved=0](http%3A%2F%2Fwww.realincomes.org.uk%2Fclassdivstab.htm&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=C5kWi1mEAQShB54kksWPnp4YCIvYkLd0kz7TWo4WMLg%3D&reserved=0) ...Now tell me, what's

\*Wrong\* with \*This\* picture?... – Note the 2008-2020 QE 'ramp', then note the 2020-2021 \*Spike\*... – Then further note the L/H scale is in 1,000s of Billions, ie: \*Trillions\* (...Pic from University of Michigan's Federal Reserve Economic Database, sourced from this article:

[https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.zerohedge.com%2Fpolitical%2Fheres-why-new-covid-relief-program-will-turn-working-class-serfs&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=3ejhPNJ%2B2rck3dBAik%2F6pyFdvQrtVobEn0S7igjDdKg%3D&reserved=0)

[url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.zerohedge.com%2Fpolitical%2Fheres-why-new-covid-relief-program-will-turn-working-class-serfs&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=3ejhPNJ%2B2rck3dBAik%2F6pyFdvQrtVobEn0S7igjDdKg%3D&reserved=0](https%3A%2F%2Fwww.zerohedge.com%2Fpolitical%2Fheres-why-new-covid-relief-program-will-turn-working-class-serfs&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=3ejhPNJ%2B2rck3dBAik%2F6pyFdvQrtVobEn0S7igjDdKg%3D&reserved=0)...

...US M1 Money Supply, 1960-2021: (...Q: – Now just \*Where\* do y'all think pretty much \*Alla\* that \*Went\* (and subsequently \*Stayed Put\*)?...)

- First time commenting here. Today I just couldn't stand. I've checked the whole article and comments for instances of 'capitali'.

Until now just 4 instances, not a one in article. Horror!!! No wonder we are in deep shit, since knowledge of who is banging us from behind is almost literally absent. Century+ years ago Marx predicted, capitalism

will end in monopoly capitalism and that is exactly what we are experiencing now. They will buy everything, they will control everything. Sadly, even majority of the "left" would probably not agree with me on this point, because they believe monopoly capitalism happened during robber barons times. Never mind that concentration of capital today is unprecedented and is just increasing. And when I hear lamenting about feudalism.....I don't know whether to be sad or angry. From article: "The short answer is fairly simple: It's about greed, and it's about control. "

Sure, control, power, no doubt. But greed.....Invoking greed is completely useless psychologization. It's excellent time for an adage, one profane and profound: Why a dog is licking his balls? Because he is able to, because he can!!!! No bs about he likes it or.....ability is first.

Therefore the right question is: What is the basis that allows today monopolists to grab? I haven't been precise enough in the third line from the end. It's not just that ability is first, it is a necessary condition. To rephrase the final question, a million dollar question, not a rhetorical question, for most people is unfortunately like to ask what 42 means and I predict I won't get the right answer: What is the ultimate necessary condition for monopolists' grabbing???

- The investor class has a powerful ally (as if we didn't know that) in the FHA in the US. Example: the condo community I live in now has so many rentals that the FHA will not approve a loan. Since these are lower end condos, FHA loan approval is absolutely crucial for a prospective buyer. Consequently, one has almost no choice but to sell to an investor – who is able to pay cash.

They got you coming and going.

- Yup. Ban ownership all non-resident owned property, along with the existence of all forms of corporate stock ownership, and the "rental" problem resolves in a flash. Of course no one backs these logical remedies, because they're invested in IMF and World Bank controlled portfolios and pension funds. Who's zoomin' who?

- Some guy in libya did it once, does anyone remember what happened to him? Muammar al Ghadafi. "Today there is swine flu. Perhaps tomorrow there will be fish flu, because sometimes we produce viruses by controlling them. It is a commercial business. Capitalist companies produce viruses so that they can generate and sell vaccinations. That is very shameful and poor ethics. Vaccinations and medicine should not be sold," he said. He went on to say that "medicines should be free of charge and vaccinations given free to children, but capitalist companies produce the viruses and vaccinations and want to make a profit. Why are they not free of charge? We should give them free of charge, and not sell them." Muammar Gaddafi Speech To United Nations - September 23, 2009

- Sure our equally faux Govt will soon roll out this horror show too:



<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.rt.com%2Fusa%2F530813- eviction-blackrock-great- reset%2F&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=FG28RJwjhTOzCQNO1WyRMMMUiCaaJ4lbAp5JDyHf8c%3D&reserved=0>

- Hello everyone! Re: Housing market in cities. Its fckin scandalous what's going on in cities throughout the world. Average people who work damned hard for their barely minimum wages can't get the mortgages to afford to buy at even the bottom end of the market in the cities they were born in. They can't save enough for a deposit cos the prices are constantly rising. Private rentals are through the roof and there is a very, very long waiting list for cheaper, social housing. This is an excellent documentary I saw on TV not so long ago. Sorry I can't find a link for the whole film. The situation has gotten even worse since this film was made in 2019. 'Push' 2019 trailer:

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.youtube.com%2Fwatch%3Fv%3D2iLWpuZrd- l&data=04%7C01%7Crulescommitteeagenda%40sanjoseca.gov%7Cf6d099bbdc194906528f08d97f984442%7C0fe33be061424f969b8d7817d5c26139%7C1%7C0%7C637681114259679140%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=98NYDARB%2FfPee8VF58j1RHRMYKwxBRp5y6ZOI2YHnI8%3D&reserved=0>

'Landlords without faces.

Apartments without renters. A documentary exploring the new, unlivable city. Housing prices are skyrocketing in cities worldwide. Incomes are not. The working and middle classes are getting pushed out of cities, while financial powerhouses use housing as a place to park money. PUSH is a documentary from award-winning director Fredrik Gertten, investigating why we can't afford to live in our own cities anymore. We follow UN Special Rapporteur on Housing, Leilani Farha, on her quest to understand who's getting squeezed, who's getting rich and why housing has become one of today's most pressing world issues? ' The film had its World Premiere at CPH:DOX, 2019, where it won the coveted Audience Award.

- I don't know how wonderful a mortgage is. My darling ex paid for it for a while. Though as a migrant DownUnder coming from Berlin about 75% rent. The way the city council administers a quarter of a million buildings means rent doesn't kill life off as it does in similar sized anglo amerikanized cities like Sydney, which mortgage as the con to freedom when you are almost dead means no life before you get there. Saving for the deposit for instance at a time when you are twenty something should be spent getting ripped into life. Conconvind 19-33 or not. Sitting nowhere to save every penny because you known when you're old blah blah blah leaves no money to get into life. Which is perhaps what the politicians want. As they are proving with the lock up regime of no choice. Furthermore one's money ought if possible to be invested in you choice so that with a better saving amount nationally foreign take overs will less than more. In Australia is it basically non

existent. No one invests in anything. When Darwin harbour was up for the 99 yr lease no Australian firm, company or investors stepped up because the money was wasted in non productive real estate. The Chinese won the contract. Now the government is complaining that this is the Chinese Governments infiltration of Australia. Well almost. Implied. Apart from nearly all production DownUnder is US, UK, Holland and then EU, Japan in minerals mainly. The Chinese have stopped buying coal and Russian tenders have won some contracts. If the locals put their money where their mouths were they'd have more local ownership. A mortgage is not a life. Though the banks are laughing without having to try it on to get your life signed away for the next quarter of century – spent doing nothing cause you got no money. Most inner cities compared to other societies here are basically lame.

- ...Calling 'em Vampires would be granting them a generous romanticism/glamour that they \*Do Not\* deserve... – Straight-up-and-down \*Leeches\* is what they are, in point of fact... - \*Life-Sucking Leeches\*...

- Two phenomena are occurring in parallel, at least here in Canada. On the one hand, in the cities, what we call "renovictions" are multiplying and throwing hundreds of families out on the street who can't find new housing. New landlords like Blackrock are buying up apartment blocks and shortly afterwards send eviction letters to tenants because major renovation work is needed. These renovations often involve cutting the number of units in a building by half and turning them into deluxe apts. Current tenants can't afford and, as a result, many people are looking for new housing and prices are skyrocketing. On the other hand, more financially comfortable people, mostly retired baby boomers with good pensions, are buying second and third homes in the countryside, which has pushed up house prices by 20-40% in a few months. Add to this refurbishing of of primary residences and their new second homes, which is driving up the price of lumber and creating shortages. In addition, covid-19 has created a buying frenzy: cars, RVs, motorcycles, electric bikes, boats, etc., it's completely crazy. Everything is going up except the inflation rate. People are living like there's no tomorrow. Maybe they're right. Personally I see a gloomy tomorrow. There's also dire staff shortages in every sector. Things are not looking good and expect tribulations before owning nothing and being happy.

- 'it's completely crazy. Everything is going up except the inflation rate. People are living like there's no tomorrow. Maybe they're right. Personally I see a gloomy tomorrow.'..... Yes Jean, I've been discussing this craziness with friends for quite a while now. Zero % interest rates on regular savings accounts, so people are being coerced into 'investing' with any extra cash they may have. The stock markets and housing markets are booming it seems. Mortgage rates have been at an all time low for years.

If (or more likely when) there is a massive crash it will be the small 'investors' who will suffer after naively risking all their hard-earned

savings. It may be quite lucrative for some right now, but I don't see how it can carry on like this. This surely can't be a sign of a healthy economy....or maybe it is, but only for wealthy people. I don't know.

- A book called The Thought Experiment shows the quantum outcome of changing these things using thought patterning of the masses that Google and Facebook use every second of every day: 1) Obfuscation: Just basic confusion of one thing for another- a smoke and mirrors game. 2) World View Poisoning: Conditioning the way people view human nature and their own self-value. 3) Conditioning of Primal Fear: The exploitation of primal fears. 4) Divide and Conquer Strategy: Highlight any perceived differences between people and then exploit those differences to create infighting so they are easier to control and conquer. 5) Indoctrination of Education System: A left brain form of Nazis called it mastery learning. grade school, HS and university. Trivium and quadrivium education could counteract this. 6) Controlled Opposition: Basic dialectics - dialectical mechanics or Hegelianism Creating conflict that you already have an outcome management system for. Create the conflict and wait for a type of reaction to the conflict (usually chaotic that demands a resolution) and then you step in and resolve it. Artificial conflict resolution. 7) Monetary System of Control: Debt based fiat currency fractional reserve banking a system of illusion that we call money yet people believe in it like its a religion or god. People seem to be the most powerless to come out of. It exists purely in the mind. 8) Control of Mass Media: If you can control the info that people get to see hear and read you control their perception of reality. If you limit the scope of what they can take into their minds and awareness you limit their possibilities of solutions. Human perception management. 9) Food and Medicine: attack on the physical aspects of the body relates to how our brain development goes. You affect thought and consciousness you are what you eat. Use techniques that are damaging to consciousness through the modern medical system 10) Illusion of Time: Very important for people to grasp. Play on people's seeming inability to live in true present moment awareness-- getting people to live in regret over the past or anxiety over the future. Its a fear based technique. Takes us out of true present awareness. Being fully present now to take on what is happening now. If our consciousness can be manipulated into always looking into what has happened. It takes away effectiveness of dealing with the current situation. 11) The DHR Factor: Denial, Hassle, Ridicule: What other people perceive about you. Denial, hassle ridicule factor. Things are fine the way they are I don't want to rock the boat because I may have to deal with hassle of other people. The hassle free zone is-- I don't want all the uncomfortable aspects of life that come with standing up for truth. These are all fear based. Heightening those three forms of mental instability. Trap of inactivity and not really doing anything to make things better. 12) Religion: We need to understand these last three the best. Religion is a form of binding. To tie back Re-Ligare tying back. Forms of modern religion are mind control

based on astro-theology. Giving people an exoteric version of something that was once esoteric or internal. Government is the binding on the left brain... religion is the binding of the right brain. 13) Use of Subversive Symbolism: Based on ancient sacred symbolism. Based on symbols that have been with us from antiquity. Solar symbolism, life force symbols, energy, blood, or anything we need for existence and life. They use these in modern institutions--- banks, police, media, stores. We're drenched in it. Basic symbols have a powerful psychic influence. They can speak to us without words. A wordless form of communication. Connects to occultism. 14) Problem-Reaction-Solution (Chaos Sorcery): A mass demonstration or a public display of the dark aspects of the Hegelian dialectic. Hegelian dialectic can be used in a positive or negative sense. Chaos sorcery or false flag terrorism. This is ritual magic being used openly in the light of day. You are creating a chaotic situation in the light of day and you know it will elicit an extreme reaction of fear and chaos that demands order be brought as soon as possible. You are manipulating the fear in the limbic system-- people are not in a state that they can reason. They are demanding solutions purely out of emotions. They are in a reactive mode of consciousness. They want the outcome of the game known before the game is played. Interject chaos, you know the reaction its going to cause and you know. A leap in consciousness will subvert this technique. This technique works over and over again. Humanity won't wake up. 9-11 was chaos sorcery.

- The astronomical prices for houses in the USA is caused almost 100% by the Fed buying a minimum of \$40 billion a month in mortgage backed securities, the very instruments responsible for the GFC of 2008. Hard to make this shit up. For those who are not familiar with them, the banks make Ninja loans to deadbeats, then they immediately sell them to the Wall Street megabanks, who package them together as MBS. In 2008 the megabanks sold them to brain dead bureaucrats who run pension funds around the world. Now even they are to wary to buy them, so the Fed just prints the money out of thin air and buys them, adding them to their exponentially growing balance sheet. "Give me control of a nation's money and I care not who makes the laws." ~ Mayer Amschel Rothschild [Mayer Amschel Bauer] (1744 -1812), Godfather of the Rothschild Banking Cartel of Europe

- Fed: "That's a nice housing market you have there. Be a shame if somethin' happened to it." They did much the same early last year when they helpfully stepped in with generous loans to the flailing paper industry. The dread virus locked everyone up, paper usage took a tumble, the fed issued loans and bought up tumbling bonds, the year moved on and things re-opened, the fed sells back the bonds at interest PLUS gets the interest from the ongoing loans. Rinse, repeat, forever.

- US Federal Reserve provided over \$16 trillion in financial assistance to some of the largest financial institutions and businesses, in USA and abroad, a clear case of socialism for the rich. – Bernie Sanders, 2011.

Our investigation reveals that Federal Reserve provided at least \$29.6 trillion in aid. Only one of these facilities, amounting to 12.9%, was within its mandate to protect the commercial banking system. The rest was an attempt to rescue the shadow banking sector, which is highly leveraged and hardly regulated or supervised. – Andrew Felkerson & Nicola Matthews, 2011

Tagged with: Atlantic, BlackRock, Economics, finance, guardian, home ownership, renting, the new normal, Vanguard,

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

**Fw: 71 Vista Montaña Gross Mistake!**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 10:18 AM

**To:** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 9:41 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** FW: 71 Vista Montaña Gross Mistake!

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

From: Alma Goldchain &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 9:40 AM

To: david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: 71 Vista Montaña Gross Mistake!

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

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

It's now been 3 weeks and the issues for this site keep arising!

First, we were grossly deceived by Council Member David Cohen! He got the media on his side to appear to make him look like a hero with the homeless encampment situation that was encroaching on the Apple site at North First Street and Component Drive, where the homeless started a fire. Apple gave the City \$3 million to get rid of their problem and now it's ours, thanks to Mr. Cohen and Mr. Lam Nguyen, his Communications Director.

Mr. Nguyen came on that first night of our protest to see and find the gross incompetence that his boss created. He came to see how he could spin all the miscalculations this site contained. Seems he was successful in creating a smoke screen, because that was what was conveyed via the media.

Mr. Cohen and Home First have scammed the City into using these homeless individuals as pawns, and who I might add refused a motel room, to park their inoperable vehicles on the site the City purchased



last year and create a dump site in the middle of our neighborhood!

This same site was deemed uninhabitable due to high levels of arsenic in the soil! The City was well aware of this and yet still housed these individuals on this lot! How cruel is that?

This so called "safe" RV parking site that the City created in this tightly packed neighborhood, has turned out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing up every week.

Just yesterday in plain site, there was oil spilled on the ground, rags, a bucket of oil left carelessly inside the "safe" parking site and what looked like some kind of highly flammable white liquid thrown over the fence onto the lawn and the bushes on the other side of the fence! Where was the security? Why was this individual allowed to treat this site as a garage as opposed to a "safe parking site?"

The fresh paint was also dumped on the curb, and a broken alcohol bottle was thrown there too! (We have photos to prove all this!) All of these items were found on the other side of the fence! That is part of OUR Neighborhood! Not your neighborhood! OUR NEIGHBORHOOD Mayor Licardo! Not 5 blocks from our homes, but only feet from our homes!

The people whom the city has moved here have a history of being irresponsible, they proved that at the Apple Site! They caused multiple fires and trashed the entire location.

The City moved these people in the middle of a very over-crowded and heavily populated neighborhood a couple of feet away from townhomes and right next door to a children's park! How does that make sense?

I am beyond disgusted that the City of San Jose believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight! That's delusional! Instead, the City has targeted our neighborhood for others to show up here and park on our streets! That's been happening since this was advertised by the City as a safe place to park!

The city is being proved wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner! Many of us witnessed this! This is a crosswalk that usually always has pedestrians walking across it!

Not to mention that last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Their usual habit of creating dump sites proves their conduct hasn't changed and the cheap Security is not able to enforce the rules as falsely promised.

Residents also saw a person on the play equipment in the kids park smoking weed! That happened the 2nd week of this "experiment!"

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site, who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what the City thinks! That means the City doesn't even know who is staying there!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration, same red van that has the oil bucket and created the toxic trash! What is that? Since when do people who don't pay taxes have more rights than people who follow the law and pay their taxes to live in this neighborhood?

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There



are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly and have a history of causing fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped the City is with tiny fire extinguishers! Even the Fire Department agreed to the fire hazards found on this site, the first night this lot was created!

Also, we should mention that the security car outside the fence seems to be consistently abandoned? It seems that there is now only 1 guard there which means less security! The City has NO CLUE what's happening inside and outside the lot! Unfortunately, because of all this, it's affecting all our lives!

There's also tan/gray SUV that we noticed is filled with possessions parked on Renaissance! Not inside the lot but on the outside of the lot! The City has targeted our neighborhood and now these people think it's OK to park here outside of the fenced area! Its beyond despicable what they have done!

I request you to put an end to this unsafe site ASAP! This is not what the City signed up for! It's a HUGE waste of money with no accountability! Who is benefiting from this? It's not the homeless and it sure is hell isn't the residents who live here!

Regards,

Alma Goldchain

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



by the RVs, and how they are allowed to pollute our neighborhood and contribute to global warming AND causes asthmatic reactions from our children - no answer from the city of San Jose. We complained about the cigarette smoking that poisons the children in the parks and residences that are mere feet away from the camp - again, no answer.

And there are many many other issues such a camper dumping toxic engine fluid onto the ground where children and pets walk - we have photos of this by the way - yet the city is silent.

You are literally poisoning your citizens and you stand by doing NOTHING. Shame on you!

And all for what? A handsome campaign contribution from a big tech company! Do your careers mean more to you than the lives of San Jose children??!!

We need answers.

This campground was a huge mistake and must be shut down for the children AND the campers.

Please reply with answers ASAP.

Thomas E Doherty

Sent from my iPhone

### **Silicon Valley's Guantanamo Bay**

Guantanamo Bay, aka "Gitmo", is a military prison located on the island of Cuba, and was established by the George W. Bush administration after the 9/11 terrorists' attacks. In the opinion of many, the conditions are deplorable, and legal issues, such as a lack of due process, have made Gitmo infamous on a global scale. After twenty years of operation, many wonder why it's still around. In fact, President Joe Biden has promised to shut it down before he leaves office.

As we remember 9/11's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary closing Gitmo seems to make a lot of sense.

But the City of San Jose, the self-proclaimed "capital" of Silicon Valley, has decided to do the exact opposite. They have recently opened a site which, to me and many others, bears many similarities to the notorious Gitmo prison. The site, located at 71 Vista Montana in North San Jose, is an encampment for homeless people who live in their RVs. It's a parking lot of an abandoned building which once housed the semiconductor company Supertex.

Let's look at some of the similarities of what the San Jose politicians have created at this camp:

- Like Gitmo, the camp is surrounded by a tall cyclone fence that is topped with razor wire. Repeat: **razor wire**. I thought that America was about freedom. Not razor wire.
- Like Gitmo, access to the camp can only be granted by a guard – not sure if they are armed or not – and the general public is not welcome.
- Like Gitmo, the camp is under 24/7 video surveillance.

- Like Gitmo, the camp has extremely bright klieg lights that turn every night into broad daylight.
- Like Gitmo, no one moves at the camp without being watched.
- Like Gitmo, the “residents” spend 95%+ of their time behind locked doors. Admittedly, they do this by their choice. Which isn’t good either.

While Gitmo is really bad, here’s where it’s even **worse** for the homeless campers:

- Gitmo has indoor plumbing – the encampment does not. The campers must leave their RVs, day or night, rain or shine, hot or cold, to use an unsanitary porta potty when nature calls. And the campers have no inside running water for drinking and showering.
- Gitmo has air conditioning – the encampment does not. Imagine being locked inside an un-air-conditioned RV on a hot California day.
- Gitmo has on-site medical facilities – the encampment does not. Residents, some of whom may have medical conditions, must travel quite far to obtain care.
- Gitmo does not allow drugs – yet there’s already been a **used hypodermic needle** found at the encampment.
- **Potentially worst of all:** Gitmo is not a toxic waste site. The encampment, located at the former Supertex headquarters, has been documented to contain arsenic and other poisons. Arsenic is used in semiconductor production and is harmful to humans. A quote from a [June 15, 2020 study](#) conducted by the city of San Jose states: “**Elevated levels of arsenic, lead, and pesticides** have been found in the soil beneath the property...”

How the @#\$%! did this happen?

It turns out the camp residents were once camped on land owned by tech giant Apple Computer. Apple, in a massive “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) push, convinced the city of San Jose, and especially city councilman David Cohen, to “take the homeless RVers off their hands.” I wouldn’t be surprised if some campaign contributions flowed from Apple to the city politicians to help facilitate this matter.

In their haste to placate Apple and possibly to make selfish political gains, Mr. Cohen and the other politicians chose the 71 Vista Montana site and did virtually NO research, as is painfully obvious from the list of issues above. The reality is that there are several other, better sites. For example, one nearby site has a medical facility right next to it. Also, there are many hotels for homeless people which would happily house these people.

Mr. Cohen calls this “an experiment.”

What? Experimenting on some of the most vulnerable citizens of Silicon Valley? Seriously?

The circumstances for the homeless are tragic and we *must* help them. But the 71 Vista Montana site only makes their lives worse. And all because of a corporation who cried NIMBY and a politician who wanted to make a name for himself at the expense of those who are temporarily down on their luck. The homeless are being made pawns in a tragic game played by huge tech corporations and politicians; the homeless are the ones who, sadly, lose out.

I encourage you to write to the city of San Jose. The mayor, Sam Liccardo, councilman David Cohen, and pretty much anyone in the San Jose government. We are Silicon Valley. We are built on the can-do spirit. This camp does not represent Silicon Valley values and must be shut down. For the people’s sake.

Please forward to anyone who cares about the homeless and wants to give them proper care.

Sincerely,

Thomas E Doherty

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





**Fw: Broken promises 71 Vista Montana encampment**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 11:36 AM

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

**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:** Shprese Demiri-Head <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 10:59 AM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Broken promises 71 Vista Montana encampment

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

[External Email]

To whom it may concern,

Our neighborhood is constantly being bombarded and invaded by people who do not belong in this encampment. We are seeing people living outside of the encampment and living in their cars and they are constantly leaving their cars parked in front of homes for days on end. There have been vehicles inside of the encampment and around the encampment that do not operate and they have to be towed. Some of the RVs that are in the encampment have a ton of garbage on top of them on the side on the ground. Prior to this encampment being placed here without logic, our neighborhood was very clean and well kept and now it's deteriorating by the minute. I used to take my children to the park. I'm a mother of four now. We can't even go to the park. It is so poorly managed and there is junk all around on the ground. How can you city officials take this away from our children? Shame on you! You brought a homeless encampment in the children's playground.



## Fw: Citizen's voice against 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking and lack of communication from city

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 9/27/2021 11:41 AM

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

### 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:** giyoon21c <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 11:19 AM  
**To:** Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Citizen's voice against 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking and lack of communication from city

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

[External Email]

Hi Rosalynn,

Over the weekend, I met my immediate neighbor on a different row - a nice couple who resides in Renaissance and I was heart broken to hear that they are putting their condo out for a market. Husband (works in IT) was busy doing remodeling and cleaning up the garage over the weekend.

From the brief conversation, they said that the RV park by the city was the tipping point over to put the house on the market.

Safe Parking or not (no matter how you want to paint it), we didn't agree to it and you put it there just because it's a city owned land. I'd like to remind you that there is an adjacent children's park right next to it.

There are numerous violations at the site's protocol that we were assured of prior and logical reasons why this site should have never been THE place. So far, the all our requests seem to be met with "tire 'em out, they will go away".

I drive this area by every day for daily commute wondering and worrying about what new event will unfold. Do you think it's the right thing to do? Many parents have stopped taking their children to the park.

Yes, homeless is a big problem now as I am just finding out because of this incident. However, the decision to put it so close the the children's park and densely populated residential neighborhood needs re-examination and immediate injunction.

Please re-consider this RV safe site so closed to children's park and residential neighborhood and put some robust community involved decision making process when it comes to the unhoused.

Thank you.

Giyoung Yoon

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



- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are not trained for this population, unlike case workers
- It is **TWO FEET away from a children's park** and residences

\$400K for 9 months is a gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
  - (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though David Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be there)
- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive as HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!
- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
  - There's a dead car battery sitting on top of a recycling can
  - A can of paint was dumped next to the site
  - We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site
- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

## 2) Broken Promises

- This is marketed as RV parking, yet several of the vehicles parked are pickup trucks or vans
- Very few people are living there
- Cohen told us it is only for Apple sites but someone from the Coleman encampment was allowed into the program on the first day
- There are supposed to be two security guards there 24/7, but we've only seen one at a time. There is also an empty patrol car parked
- Cars do not appear operational. They were towed in and one person was seen working under the hood of the car on what seems to be a failed oil change.
  - If not operational, now do they get more fuel for generators or cooking or dump their gray water?

The 71 Vista Montaña needs to be shut down NOW before more money is wasted in a program that seems lose-lose-lose for the neighbors, the homeless people, and the city.

**How in your good conscience can allow this happen?**

Srinath

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

**Fw: Questions about 71 Vista Montana's future**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 11:58 AM

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

**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:** Karthik Suresh <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 11:56 AM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Questions about 71 Vista Montana's future

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

[External Email]

Dear SJCC members and colleagues

As a resident of North San Jose adjacent to the 71 Vista Montana we have been seeking answers but have been given a run around for answers. The request for public records has been delayed and based on the email I received there seems to be hesitation in providing information, which if true should support everything that has been shared by SJCC so far. However, I'd like to seek some specific answers to questions we have been asking but are still waiting for a direct response-

1. Which committee/council/set of individuals made the decision to use this site? We understand this was treated as an emergency used but its been almost a month the site

was opened but there must be some entity that proposed this site to be the best option vs the Gold St site.

2. It'll soon be 11% of the duration the site was intended for its original use. What plans has SJCC executed to get the RV residents into permanent housing? What progress has been made to find an alternate site as mentioned by Councilman David Cohen.

3. How is the City planning to communicate with the neighborhood residents? The City has executed RV safe parking and plans a 500+ affordable housing unit without considering the lack of safety or street parking problems we face. How can we collaborate to ensure our inputs are considered so that this neighborhood doesn't deteriorate?

4. With the winters approaching, what is the City doing to provide heating to the RV residents without using generators or any other means that will worsen the air quality in the neighborhood?

Thanks,  
Karthik

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

**Fw: so called "safe" RV parking site at 71 Vista Montana**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 1:09 PM

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

**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:** k panikka <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:05 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** so called "safe" RV parking site at 71 Vista Montana

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

[External Email]

Dear city council,

The so called "safe" RV parking site that you moved to this tightly packed neighborhood is turning out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing every week. The latest is oil spilled on the ground, rags, bucket of oil left carelessly on the "safe" parking site. There was also fresh paint dumped on curb, and a broken alcohol bottle! (We have photos to prove all these).



The people whom the city has moved here has history of being irresponsible at the Apple site - causing multiple fires and trashing the entire location. City moved these people into the midst of this dense neighborhood feet away from residences and a kids park. I cannot believe that the city believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight!

And, the city is being proven wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner - it was no mis-calculated timing, he started and moved after the red light. This was at a crosswalk usually almost always occupied by pedestrians

Last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Neither the of conduct is being followed by the residents, not is it being enforced by the security. Residents also saw a person on the play equipment in the kids park smoking weed.

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what city thinks! That means the city doesn't even know stays here!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration.

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly, has a history of having caused fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped city is with tiny fire extinguishers!

This site, which you call "safe" parking site - is literally the opposite. You have put people who have proven themselves to be irresponsible in the midst of this community with your only hope being them sticking to a code of conduct. And they are proving themselves to be not able to that week after week.

I request you to put an end to this unsafe site as soon as you can

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

**Fw: homeless encampment in the children's playground**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 1:08 PM

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

**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:** Rajasekar N <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:06 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** homeless encampment in the children's playground

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

[External Email]

**Subject:** RV parking site at 71 Vista Montana - affecting safety in layout, kids safety

Dear city council,

The so called "safe" RV parking site that you moved to this tightly packed neighborhood is turning out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing every week. The latest is oil spilled on the ground, rags, bucket of oil left carelessly on the "safe" parking site. There was also fresh paint dumped on curb, and a broken alcohol bottle! (We have photos to prove all these).

The people whom the city has moved here has history of being irresponsible at the Apple site - causing multiple fires and trashing the entire location. City moved these people into the midst of this dense neighborhood feet away from residences and a kids park. I cannot believe that the city believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight!

And, the city is being proven wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner - it was no mis-calculated timing, he started and moved after the red light. This was at a crosswalk usually almost always occupied by pedestrians

Last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Neither the of conduct is being followed by the residents, not is it being enforced by the security. Residents also saw a person on the parking equipment in the kids park smoking weed.

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what city thinks! That means the city doesn't even know stays here!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration.

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly, has a history of having caused fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped city is with tiny fire extinguishers!

This site, which you call "safe" parking site - is literally the opposite. You have put people who have proven themselves to be irresponsible in the midst of this community with your only hope being them sticking to a code of conduct. And they are proving themselves to be not able to that week after week.

I request you to put an end to this unsafe site as soon as you can

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

**Fw: Vista Montana RV parking : gross mismanagement**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 1:08 PM

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

**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:** k panikka <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:12 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Vista Montana RV parking : gross mismanagement

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

[External Email]

The decision to move an RV park for the homeless is a gross mistake from the city

71 Vista Montaña is not suitable as a Safe RV housing site for the following reasons:

- The property has dangerously high levels of arsenic <http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic>. Inspection revealed it is uninhabitable for residential use
- There are no wraparound services: no health clinics nearby, only underqualified case-workers (no degree required!) offering sporadic support
- There is no access to real bathrooms, no running water -- only two portapotties

- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are not trained for this population, unlike case workers
- It is TWO FEET away from a children's park and residences

Why did the city choose this site?

We still do not have answers

Because the city has no answers!

let us not do SOMETHING - whatever comes to someone's mind - without planning

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

## Fw: How the city council is breaking the promises: safe parking site in N San Jose

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 9/27/2021 1:08 PM

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

## 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:** k panikka <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:16 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris  
 <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo,  
 Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio  
 <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David  
 <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev  
 <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia  
 <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt  
 <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] >; Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>;  
 Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4  
 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; 7 [REDACTED] City Clerk  
 <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking  
 <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** How the city council is breaking the promises: safe parking site in N San Jose

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

[External Email]

\$400K for 9 months is a gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
  - (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be there)
- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive at HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!

- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
  - There's a dead car battery sitting on top of a recycling can
  - A can of paint was dumped next to the site
  - We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site
- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

An FAQ was given to residents who attended a meeting on Sep 3 by City staff. The promises are broken.

The city did not only do this move in a rush, it also is not able to execute it properly - broken promises, and people in RVs not sticking to code of conduct.

Thanks

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



**Fw: Questions: regarding so called "safe" RV park**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 1:08 PM

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

**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:** k panikka <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:18 PM**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]

&gt;; Ho, Wendy &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

Hughey, Rosalynn &lt;Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Brown, Stacey &lt;Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; District4 &lt;District4@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; [REDACTED] City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Nguyen, Lam &lt;Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Safe Parking &lt;Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

**Subject:** Questions: regarding so called "safe" RV park

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

[External Email]

Please answer:

1. Which committee/council/set of individuals made the decision to use this site? We understand that an EOC was used but its been almost a month since the site opened but we still do not have answers
2. It'll soon be 11% of the duration the site was intended for its original use. What plans has SJCC executed to get the RV residents into permanent housing? What progress has been made to find an alternate site as mentioned by Councilman David Cohen.

3. How is the City planning to communicate with the neighborhood residents? The City has executed RV safe parking and plans a 500+ affordable housing unit without considering the lack of safety or street parking. How can we collaborate to ensure our inputs are considered so that this neighborhood doesn't deteriorate?
4. With the winters approaching what is the city doing to provide heating to the RV residents without using generators or any other means that will worsen the air quality in the neighborhood ?

Has any of this being thought through?

Thanks

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

## Fw: 09/27 -- 71 Vista Montaña RV parking site experiment is not the right place in middle of 5000+ residents with kids, pets and families

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 9/27/2021 1:07 PM

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

### 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:** prashant maloo <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:49 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Perez, Raul <Raul.Perez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** 09/27 -- 71 Vista Montaña RV parking site experiment is not the right place in middle of 5000+ residents with kids, pets and families

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

[External Email]

Hello,

71 Vista Montaña is not suitable as a Safe RV housing site for the following reasons:

- The property has dangerously high levels of arsenic <http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic>. Inspection revealed it is uninhabitable for residential use
- There are no wraparound services: no health clinics nearby, only underqualified case-workers (no

degree required!) offering sporadic support

- There is no access to real bathrooms, no running water -- only two portapotties
- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on-site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are not trained for this population, unlike caseworkers
- It is TWO FEET away from a children's park and residences

\$400K for 9 months is gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
  - (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be there)
- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive at HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!
- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
  - There's a dead car battery sitting on top of a recycling can
  - A can of paint was dumped next to the site
  - We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site
- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

The 71 Vista Montaña needs to be shut down NOW before more money is wasted in a program that seems lose-lose-lose for the neighbors, the homeless people, and the city.

Thanks,  
Prashant

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

## Fw: Safe RV Site shows terrible decision-making and execution!

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 9/27/2021 1:13 PM

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

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

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 1:07 PM

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

**Subject:** Fw: Safe RV Site shows terrible decision-making and execution!

## 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:** Sheena Madan <

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:51 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]

Ho, Wendy <

Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Safe RV Site shows terrible decision-making and execution!

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

[External Email]

Dear San Jose City and County Officials,

71 Vista Montaña is not suitable as a Safe RV housing site for the following reasons. It is your responsibility to get this wasteful, ineffective, contaminated site shut down:

- The property has dangerously high levels of arsenic <http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic>. Inspection revealed it is uninhabitable for residential use
- There are no wraparound services: no health clinics nearby, only underqualified case-workers (no degree required!) offering sporadic support
- There is no access to real bathrooms, no running water -- only two portapotties
- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are NOT TRAINED for this population, unlike case workers
- It is TWO FEET away from a children's park and residences

\$400K for 9 months is a gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
  - (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be there)
- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive at HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!
- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating (<https://photos.app.goo.gl/2nJbE8TsSw37WTJW9>, sent to [safe.parking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safe.parking@sanjoseca.gov))
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
  - There's a car battery sitting on top of a recycling can
  - A can of paint was freshly dumped next to the site
  - We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site
- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage (against the intention of the site)
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

The 71 Vista Montaña needs to be shut down NOW before more money is wasted in a program that seems lose-lose-lose for the neighbors, the homeless people, and the city.

Thank you,  
Sheena

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





To rectify these we, as a community, suggest you **move the site into city hall** which is much more cost effective, and has all the amenities, for the health and well being of the campers.

**Results** are far from what you have presented to the public.

**Reality** : The 71 Vista Montaña needs to be shut down NOW before more money is wasted in a program that seems lose-lose-lose for the neighbors, the homeless people, and the city.

This site, which you call "safe" parking site - is literally the opposite. You have put people who have proven themselves to be irresponsible in the midst of this community with your only hope being them sticking to a code of conduct. And they are proving themselves to be not able to that week after week.

71 Vista Montaña is not suitable as a Safe RV housing site for the following reasons:

- The property has dangerously **high levels of arsenic** <http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic>. Inspection revealed it is uninhabitable for residential use
- There are no wraparound services: no health clinics nearby, only underqualified case-workers (no degree required!) offering sporadic support
- There is no access to real bathrooms, no running water -- only two portapotties
- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are not trained for this population, unlike case workers
- It is TWO FEET away from a children's park and residences

**\$400K for 9 months is a gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:**

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
  - (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be there)
- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive at HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!
- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
  - There's a dead car battery sitting on top of a recycling can
  - A can of paint was dumped next to the site
  - We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site
- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

The so called "safe" RV parking site that you moved to this tightly packed neighborhood is turning out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing every week. The latest is oil spilled on the ground, rags, bucket of oil left carelessly on the "safe" parking site. There was also fresh paint dumped on curb, and a broken alcohol bottle! (We have photos to prove all these).

The people whom the city has moved here has history of being irresponsible at the Apple site -

causing multiple fires and trashing the entire location. City moved these people into the midst of this dense neighborhood feet away from residences and a kids park. I cannot believe that the city believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight!

And, the city is being proven wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner - it was no mis-calculated timing, he started and moved after the red light. This was at a crosswalk usually almost always occupied by pedestrians

Last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Neither the conduct is being followed by the residents, not is it being enforced by the security. Residents also saw a person on the play equipment in the kids park smoking weed.

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what city thinks! That means the city doesn't even know stays here!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration.

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly, has a history of having caused fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped city is with tiny fire extinguishers!

**As responsible elected public servants you should make sure that homelessness is dealt with equitably, primary focus being health and safety of the rest of the community.**

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

**Fw: 71 vista montana safe parking issues**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 3:44 PM

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

**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:** randy shree <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 1:56 PM**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Ho, Wendy &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

Hughey, Rosalynn &lt;Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Brown, Stacey &lt;Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; District4 &lt;District4@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; [REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt; City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Nguyen, Lam &lt;Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Safe Parking &lt;Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

**Subject:** Re: 71 vista montana safe parking issues

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

[External Email]

- This is marketed as RV parking, yet several of the vehicles parked are pickup trucks or vans
- Very few people are living there
- Cohen told us it is only for Apple sites but someone from the Coleman encampment was allowed into the program on the first day

- There are supposed to be two security guards there 24/7, but we've only seen one at a time. There is also an empty patrol car parked
- Cars do not appear operational. They were towed in and one person was seen working under the hood of the car on what seems to be a failed oil change.
  - If not operational, now do they get more fuel for generators or cooking or dump their gray water?
- Which committee/council/set of individuals made the decision to use this site? We understand that an EOC was used but its been almost a month since the site opened but we still do not have answers
- It'll soon be 11% of the duration the site was intended for its original use. What plans has SJCC executed to get the RV residents into permanent housing? What progress has been made to find an alternate site as mentioned by Councilman David Cohen.
- How is the City planning to communicate with the neighborhood residents? The City has executed RV safe parking and plans a 500+ affordable housing unit without considering the lack of safety or street parking. How can we collaborate to ensure our inputs are considered so that this neighborhood doesn't deteriorate?
- With the winters approaching what is the city doing to provide heating to the RV residents without using generators or any other means that will worsen the air quality in the neighborhood ?

Randy

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

**Fw: 71 Vista Montana**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 3:44 PM

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

**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:** Jennifer Cheung <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:09 PM**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Ho, Wendy &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

Hughey, Rosalynn &lt;Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Brown, Stacey &lt;Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; District4 &lt;District4@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; [REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov &lt;david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Burton, Chris &lt;Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky &lt;Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Liccardo, Sam &lt;sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Jones, Chappie &lt;Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Jimenez, Sergio &lt;sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Peralez, Raul &lt;Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Cohen, David &lt;David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Carrasco, Magdalena &lt;Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Davis, Dev &lt;dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Esparza, Maya &lt;Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Arenas, Sylvia &lt;sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Foley, Pam &lt;Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; [REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

&lt;[REDACTED]&gt; Ho, Wendy &lt;[REDACTED]&gt; Hughey, Rosalynn &lt;Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Brown, Stacey &lt;Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; District4 &lt;District4@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; [REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt; City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Nguyen, Lam &lt;Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Safe Parking &lt;Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Nguyen, Lam &lt;Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Safe Parking &lt;Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

**Subject:** 71 Vista Montana

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

[External Email]

Dear city council,

As the parent of a 3.5 year old daughter, I am concerned with the lack of communication or responsiveness toward the residents in this neighborhood. I grew up in Los Angeles and am no stranger to homelessness; I'm not necessarily "afraid" or "scared" of homeless people. My concerns are listed below as it appears that the city is attempting to make an appearance as to how they are curbing homelessness, yet providing these homeless people with little more than a parking lot (no indoor facilities, plumbing, running water, etc). This location helps no one.

The so called "safe" RV parking site that you moved to this tightly packed neighborhood is turning out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing every week. The latest is oil spilled on the ground, rags, bucket of oil left carelessly on the "safe" parking site. There was also fresh paint dumped on curb, and a broken alcohol bottle!

The people whom the city has moved here has a history of being irresponsible at the Apple site - causing multiple fires and trashing the entire location. City moved these people into the midst of this dense neighborhood feet away from residences and a kids park. I cannot believe that the city believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight!

And, the city is being proven wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner - it was no mis-calculated timing, he started and moved after the red light. This was at a crosswalk usually almost always occupied by pedestrians

Last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Neither the of conduct is being followed by the residents, not is it being enforced by the security. Residents also saw a person on the play equipment in the kids park smoking weed.

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what city thinks! That means the city doesn't even know stays here!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration.

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly, has a history of having caused fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped city is with tiny fire extinguishers!

This site, which you call "safe" parking site - is literally the opposite. You have put people who have proven themselves to be irresponsible in the midst of this community with your only hope being them sticking to a code of conduct. And they are proving themselves to be not able to that week after week.

I request you to put an end to this unsafe site as soon as you can.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Cheung



Sent from my iPhone

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

**Fw: It's impact to our life - request city to put an end on Safe RV parking site**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 3:43 PM

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

**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:** Joe L <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:16 PM**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

&lt;[REDACTED]&gt; Ho, Wendy &lt;[REDACTED]&gt; Brown, Stacey &lt;Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; District4 &lt;District4@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Nguyen, Lam &lt;Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Safe Parking &lt;Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Mahan, Matt &lt;Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Hughey, Rosalynn &lt;Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

**Subject:** It's impact to our life - request city to put an end on Safe RV parking site

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

[External Email]

Hi city council,

Regarding the Safe RV parking site located @ 71 Vista Montana San Jose, we have been rising a big concern on the kid's safety, as it's only 2 feet away from a kid's park. we feel surprised and unbelievable that how can city place this site right next to kid's park??

We noticed that there is oil spilled on the ground without taken care of it, and couple of trash bags on the top of RV in the past days, which really affect the living environment quality of the local neighborhood.

Meanwhile, this site says there will be 24/7 security guard, but we found there is only one car parked at one of the entrances, but without a security guard in the car.

Weather is getting cold soon, how are those unhoused people to generate the heat? if using generator , it will worsen the air quality in this area.

Also, as City has found it before this site is arsenic contaminated , should not use for residential. But City is still putting those unhoused people in this site, which put their life in danger too!

So in short, we start not letting our kids to go to the park, and feel so insecure living in this area, because of this none well planned arrangement by the City.

This is 3-lose situation, bad for local neighborhood, bad for unhoused people and bad for city council that losing the trust from people who voted for you.

Therefore, we urge City to put an end on this site asap.

Thank you

Joe

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

**Fw: 71 Vista Montana RV parking encampment**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 3:43 PM

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

**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:** Sowmya Mruthyunjaya <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:28 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>  
Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** 71 Vista Montana RV parking encampment

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]

[Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello all,

Making repeated requests to you to reconsider your decision of moving the RV encampment to 71 Vista montana. It's not safe to have it next to a kids park and right across a soccer field where teens practice. It would be better to move them to a place where there are wrap-around services and these folks can be rehabilitated. There are no showers for those people to maintain good hygiene. As i noticed not many people are living there and it's a costly affair to keep them in the parking lot of an out of commission building. Hope you take community input next when you develop affordable housing.

--

Sowmya

## Fw: Citizen's voice against 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking and lack of communication from city

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 9/27/2021 3:42 PM

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

### 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:** giyoon21c <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:47 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>  
Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Citizen's voice against 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking and lack of communication from city

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

[External Email]

Re: Sharing concerns of a citizen who's daily life is impacted by the safe RV site that's been setup in 71 Vista Montana with Emphasis on personal side and direct impact on neighborhoods.

Over the weekend, I met my immediate neighbor on a different row - a nice couple who resides in Renaissance and I was heart broken to hear that they are putting their condo out for a market. Husband (works in IT) was busy doing remodeling and cleaning up the garage over the weekend.

From the brief conversation, they said that the RV park by the city was the tipping point over to put the house on the market.

Safe Parking or not (no matter how you want to paint it), we didn't agree to it and you put it there just because it's a city owned land. I'd like to remind you that there is an adjacent children's park right next to it.

There are numerous violations at the site's protocol that we were assured of prior and logical reasons why this site should have never been THE place. So far, the all our requests seem to be met with "tire 'em out, they will go away".

I drive this area by every day for daily commute wondering and worrying about what new event will unfold. Do you think it's the right thing to do? Many parents have stopped taking their children to the park.

Yes, homeless is a big problem now as I am just finding out because of this incident. However, the decision to put it so close the the children's park and densely populated residential neighborhood needs re-examination and immediate injunction.

Please re-consider this RV safe site so closed to children's park and residential neighborhood and put some robust community involved decision making process when it comes to the unhoused.

Thank you.

Giyoung Yoon

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

**Fw: Poor city planning of Homeless encampment next to children's playground**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 3:42 PM

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

**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:** Rajasekar N <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:49 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]>

Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Poor city planning of Homeless encampment next to children's playground

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

[External Email]

Dear city council,

1. Which committee/council/set of individuals made the decision to use this site? We understand that an EOC was used but its been almost a month since the site opened but we still do not have answers
2. It'll soon be 11% of the duration the site was intended for its original use. What plans has SJCC executed to get the RV residents into permanent housing? What progress has been made to find an alternate site as mentioned by Councilman David Cohen.
3. How is the City planning to communicate with the neighborhood residents? The City has executed RV safe parking and plans a 500+ affordable housing unit without considering the lack of safety



or street parking. How can we collaborate to ensure our inputs are considered so that this neighborhood doesn't deteriorate?

4. With the winters approaching what is the city doing to provide heating to the RV residents without using generators or any other means that will worsen the air quality in the neighborhood ?

I request you to put an end to this unsafe site as soon as you can.

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

**Fw: 71 Vista Montana - SJ city officials are hurting the homeless**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 5:00 PM

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

**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:** Tom Doherty <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 3:48 PM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>**Cc:** Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov>; [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>  
david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Ho, Wendy <wendy.ho@bos.sccgov.org>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** 71 Vista Montana - SJ city officials are hurting the homeless

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

[External Email]

**Silicon Valley's Gitmo is hurting homeless people**

Guantanamo Bay, aka "Gitmo", is a military prison located on the island of Cuba, and was established by the George W. Bush administration after the 9/11 terrorists' attacks. In the opinion of many, the conditions are deplorable, and legal issues, such as a lack of due process, have made Gitmo infamous on a global scale. After twenty years of operation, many wonder why it's still around. In fact, President Joe Biden has promised to shut it down before he leaves office. As we remember 9/11's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary closing Gitmo seems to make a lot of sense.

But the City of San Jose, the self-proclaimed “capital” of Silicon Valley, has decided to do the exact opposite. They have recently opened a site which, to me and many others, bears many similarities to the notorious Gitmo prison. The site, located at 71

Vista Montana in North San Jose, is an encampment for homeless people who live in their RVs. It’s a parking lot of an abandoned building which once housed the semiconductor company Supertex.

Let’s look at some of the similarities of what the San Jose politicians have created at this camp:

- Like Gitmo, the camp is surrounded by a tall cyclone fence that is topped with razor wire. Repeat: **razor wire**. I thought that America was about freedom. Not razor wire.
- Like Gitmo, access to the camp can only be granted by a guard – not sure if they are armed or not – and the general public is not welcome.
- Like Gitmo, the camp is under 24/7 video surveillance.
- Like Gitmo, the camp has extremely bright klieg lights that turn every night into broad daylight.
- Like Gitmo, no one moves at the camp without being watched.
- Like Gitmo, the “residents” spend 95%+ of their time behind locked doors. Admittedly, they do this by their choice. Which isn’t good either.

While Gitmo is really bad, here’s where it’s even **worse** for the homeless campers:

- Gitmo has indoor plumbing – the encampment does not. The campers must leave their RVs, day or night, rain or shine, hot or cold, to use an unsanitary porta potty when nature calls. And the campers have no inside running water for drinking and showering.
- Gitmo has air conditioning – the encampment does not. Imagine being locked inside an un-air-conditioned RV on a hot California day.
- Gitmo has on-site medical facilities – the encampment does not. Residents, some of whom may have medical conditions, must travel quite far to obtain care.
- Gitmo does not allow drugs – yet there’s already been a **used hypodermic needle** found at the encampment.
- **Potentially worst of all:** Gitmo is not a toxic waste site. The encampment, located at the former Supertex headquarters, has been documented to contain arsenic and other poisons. Arsenic is used in semiconductor production and is harmful to humans. A quote from a [June 15, 2020 study](#) conducted by the city of San Jose states: “**Elevated levels of arsenic, lead, and pesticides** have been found in the soil beneath the property...”

How the @#\$\$%! did this happen?

It turns out the camp residents were once camped on land owned by tech giant Apple Computer. Apple, in a massive “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) push, convinced the city of San Jose, and especially city councilman David Cohen, to “take the homeless RVers off their hands.” I wouldn’t be surprised if some campaign contributions flowed from Apple to the city politicians to help facilitate this matter.

In their haste to placate Apple and possibly to make selfish political gains, Mr. Cohen and the other politicians chose the 71 Vista Montana site and did virtually NO research, as is painfully obvious from the list of issues above. The reality is that there are several other, better sites. For example, one nearby site has a medical facility right next to it. Also, there are many hotels for homeless people which would happily house these people. Mr. Cohen calls this “an experiment.”

What? Experimenting on some of the most vulnerable citizens of Silicon Valley? Seriously?

The circumstances for the homeless are tragic and we *must* help them. But the 71 Vista Montana site only makes their lives worse. And all because of a corporation who cried NIMBY and a politician who wanted to make a name for himself at the expense of those who are temporarily down on their luck. The homeless are being made pawns in a tragic game played by huge tech corporations and politicians; the homeless are the ones who, sadly, lose out.

I encourage you to write to the city of San Jose. The mayor, Sam Liccardo, councilman David Cohen, and pretty much anyone in the San Jose government. We are Silicon Valley. We are built on the can-do spirit. This camp does not represent Silicon Valley values and must be shut down. For the people’s sake.

Please forward to anyone who cares about the homeless and wants to give them proper care.

Sincerely,

Thomas E Doherty

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

**Fw: SJ officials should be ashamed!**

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 9/27/2021 4:59 PM

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

## 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:** Kimberly Lain <[kimberly.lain@hawaii.gov](mailto:kimberly.lain@hawaii.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 3:56 PM

**To:** Tom Doherty <[REDACTED]>

**Cc:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul

<Raul.Perez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena

<Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya

<Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam

<Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov>; [REDACTED]

Δ [REDACTED] Δ [REDACTED] Δ [REDACTED]

david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>;

Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>;

Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Ho, Wendy

Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** SJ officials should be ashamed!

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

[External Email]

We, the neighbors of 71 Vista Montana, are deeply disappointed in the City of San Jose officials' broken promises, unanswered questions, lack of transparency, and outright lies to us citizens.

We have asked multiple times for a list of registered sex offenders who are living at the "safe" parking lot. Councilman promised to get us an answer but did not. We asked how

the campers would be vetted and never heard back. We asked about the greenhouse gas emitting generators that are used by the RVs, and how they are allowed to pollute our neighborhood and contribute to global warming AND causes asthmatic reactions from our children - no answer from the city of San Jose. We complained about the cigarette smoking that poisons the children in the parks and residences that are mere feet away from the camp - again, no answer.

And there are many many other issues such a camper dumping toxic engine fluid onto the ground where children and pets walk - we have photos of this by the way - yet the city is silent.

You are literally poisoning your citizens and you stand by doing NOTHING. Shame on you!

And all for what? A handsome campaign contribution from a big tech company! Do your careers mean more to you than the lives of San Jose children??!!

We need answers.

This campground was a huge mistake and must be shut down for the children AND the campers.

Please reply with answers ASAP.

Thomas E Doherty

Sent from my iPhone

### **Silicon Valley's Guantanamo Bay**

Guantanamo Bay, aka "Gitmo", is a military prison located on the island of Cuba, and was established by the George W. Bush administration after the 9/11 terrorists' attacks. In the opinion of many, the conditions are deplorable, and legal issues, such as a lack of due process, have made Gitmo infamous on a global scale. After twenty years of operation, many wonder why it's still around. In fact, President Joe Biden has promised to shut it down before he leaves office. As we remember 9/11's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary closing Gitmo seems to make a lot of sense.

But the City of San Jose, the self-proclaimed "capital" of Silicon Valley, has decided to do the exact opposite. They have recently opened a site which, to me and many others, bears many similarities to the notorious Gitmo prison. The site, located at 71

Vista Montana in North San Jose, is an encampment for homeless people who live in their RVs. It's a parking lot of an abandoned building which once housed the semiconductor company Supertex.

Let's look at some of the similarities of what the San Jose politicians have created at this camp:

- Like Gitmo, the camp is surrounded by a tall cyclone fence that is topped with razor wire. Repeat: **razor wire**. I thought that America was about freedom. Not razor wire.
- Like Gitmo, access to the camp can only be granted by a guard – not sure if they are armed or not – and the general public is not welcome.
- Like Gitmo, the camp is under 24/7 video surveillance.
- Like Gitmo, the camp has extremely bright klieg lights that turn every night into broad daylight.
- Like Gitmo, no one moves at the camp without being watched.
- Like Gitmo, the “residents” spend 95%+ of their time behind locked doors. Admittedly, they do this by their choice. Which isn’t good either.

While Gitmo is really bad, here’s where it’s even **worse** for the homeless campers:

- Gitmo has indoor plumbing – the encampment does not. The campers must leave their RVs, day or night, rain or shine, hot or cold, to use an unsanitary porta potty when nature calls. And the campers have no inside running water for drinking and showering.
- Gitmo has air conditioning – the encampment does not. Imagine being locked inside an un-air-conditioned RV on a hot California day.
- Gitmo has on-site medical facilities – the encampment does not. Residents, some of whom may have medical conditions, must travel quite far to obtain care.
- Gitmo does not allow drugs – yet there’s already been a **used hypodermic needle** found at the encampment.
- **Potentially worst of all:** Gitmo is not a toxic waste site. The encampment, located at the former Supertex headquarters, has been documented to contain arsenic and other poisons. Arsenic is used in semiconductor production and is harmful to humans. A quote from a [June 15, 2020 study](#) conducted by the city of San Jose states: “**Elevated levels of arsenic, lead, and pesticides** have been found in the soil beneath the property...”

How the @\$%#! did this happen?

It turns out the camp residents were once camped on land owned by tech giant Apple Computer. Apple, in a massive “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) push, convinced the city of San Jose, and especially city councilman David Cohen, to “take the homeless RVers off their hands.” I wouldn’t be surprised if some campaign contributions flowed from Apple to the city politicians to help facilitate this matter.

In their haste to placate Apple and possibly to make selfish political gains, Mr. Cohen and the other politicians chose the 71 Vista Montana site and did virtually NO research, as is painfully obvious from the list of issues above. The reality is that there are several other, better sites. For example, one nearby site has a medical facility right next to it. Also, there are many hotels for homeless people which would happily house these people.

Mr. Cohen calls this “an experiment.”

What? Experimenting on some of the most vulnerable citizens of Silicon Valley? Seriously?



The circumstances for the homeless are tragic and we *must* help them. But the 71 Vista Montana site only makes their lives worse. And all because of a corporation who cried NIMBY and a politician who wanted to make a name for himself at the expense of those who are temporarily down on their luck. The homeless are being made pawns in a tragic game played by huge tech corporations and politicians; the homeless are the ones who, sadly, lose out.

I encourage you to write to the city of San Jose. The mayor, Sam Liccardo, councilman David Cohen, and pretty much anyone in the San Jose government. We are Silicon Valley. We are built on the can-do spirit. This camp does not represent Silicon Valley values and must be shut down. For the people's sake.

Please forward to anyone who cares about the homeless and wants to give them proper care.

Sincerely,

Thomas E Doherty

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



**Fw: RV Parking site 71, Vista Montana : Deteriorating conditions. Need answers or plan from the city.**

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 9/27/2021 4:59 PM

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

**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:** Sugandha P <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 4:50 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RV Parking site 71, Vista Montana : Deteriorating conditions. Need answers or plan from the city.

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

[External Email]

For the attention of the City Council, San Jose.

We still do not have answers or a clear plan of action from the City to address our concerns. These are the concerns of the hard working, tax paying, law-abiding residents of communities around 71, Vista Montana.

Not only do we not have answers, but conditions at 71 Vista Montana and outside of it are deteriorating as well with people from the safe parking site running red lights without caution, spilling oil and paint in and outside of the fence and no visible security personnel as promised.

Children are no longer going to the park adjacent to this site for obvious reasons.

It is not at all like how a spokesperson of Councilmember Cohen would like to believe, who said, *"(The neighbors) are starting to realize there's nothing happening out here. They're starting to lose the wind in their sails, for lack of a better term."* This sounds to me as if you really do not care for the tax paying residents of the communities here in North San Jose and I am sorry to hear such statements from a spokesperson of the Councilmember who is supposed to represent us.

This is not just about the residents outside of 71 Vista Montana. It is also about the people who are temporarily housed in 71 Vista Montana. They do not have access to services like running water, bathrooms, qualified caseworkers, health clinics etc. It certainly does not seem like a workable solution for them either.

The result is therefore a situation that the city thinks is a solution, but saddled with astronomical costs that does not work for the relocated homeless, and does not work for the existing tax paying hard working residents of this neighborhood community.

We still have no answers on a request for an audit of the decision making process. We also have requested documentation that clearly outlines in great detail why other sites were discarded. We also requested that this process of hasty decision-making in secrecy not be repeated and for the city to be transparent about what steps are being taken about re-housing these dwellers to a permanent location away from 71 Vista Montana. Where are you with this process?

Regards,  
Sugandha.

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

**Fw: Where is the oversight?!**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 4:58 PM

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

**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:** Sheena Madan <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 4:54 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Where is the oversight?!

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

[External Email]

Dear San Jose and Santa Clara County Officials,

As I described in a previous email, the 71 Vista Montana Safe RV Parking Site fails the homeless participants, the neighbors, and the city.

However, I have a different question this time. I would like to learn what kind of recourse we have when a program like this is clearly failing. How can we alert the appropriate people and request an independent evaluation when the main channels of communication are failing us?

However, we don't seem to have a path to get this addressed. My neighbors and I have missed work and had to arrange childcare to attend:

- Two City Hall meetings
  - Cut off after 1 minute in Open Forum after waiting hours to speak
  - People "raised hand" in Zoom and did not get a chance to speak
- Housing Commission meeting
  - Told "This site has already been approved" and there is nothing to be done
- Planning Commission
  - Cut off after 1 minute in Open Forum after waiting hours to speak
  - Told this is outside the scope
- Rules and Open Government
  - Vice Mayor Jones was very patient, but clearly no follow up actions
- Community meeting with Cohen
  - Held in the last business hour before the site was supposed to open, leaving no time for addressing issue
  - Evasive answers from Councilmember Cohen
- Follow-up small meeting with Cohen
  - Councilmember Cohen did not seem to know much about who was at the site or how it was being run; no re-evaluation criteria and no explicit timeline

Obviously, you have also heard from us through e-mails and other communication. Those letters take time and effort to compose and mostly get silence or a form letter response.

Our e-mails to the only dedicated address, [safe.parking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safe.parking@sanjoseca.gov):

1. Get a patronizing response a few \_days\_ later
2. Claim the site participants are model citizens on their best behavior, unless we can present hard evidence otherwise
3. Photos and videos and eye-witness accounts showing violations of code of conduct are dismissed

Councilmember Cohen has asked us to be his "eyes and ears". Most of us don't feel safe walking by the site late in the evening anymore -- my kids haven't gone to this park since the site was announced even though we used to visit multiple times a week.

We cannot be expected to patrol it 24/7! Plus apparently we're not credible witnesses anyway. Despite that, we have hard evidence that goes ignored.

I hope I am able to communicate our frustration! How do we even get government oversight to evaluate this site against reasonable, objective criteria for success?

Why isn't the Planning Commission livid that this type of clear zoning change wasn't run by them. Even if Emergency Operations Center protocols were initially invoked, why isn't the City Council currently involved in re-evaluating this when the initial emergency is averted?

We're pouring a lot of energy trying to find the right channels to communicate and engage with you productively to find win-win solutions and getting almost no response.

Please help us figure out the right way to challenge this because this site at this location makes absolutely no sense and needs to be shut down before it permanently changes our neighborhood.

Sheena Madan

p.s. Here is the response from the Safe Parking address. I also want to note that at least several of these vehicles don't even have license plates (so it's ridiculous to expect us to record them), but we've seen them come out of or drive into the site.

"Thank you for contacting us regarding the Safe Parking site at 71 Vista Montaña. Everyone parking a vehicle at the site has agreed to a code of conduct, which includes abiding by all City ordinances and regulations. If you witness any criminal or dangerous activity in progress, please call 9-1-1. For any other incidents of concern, please gather as much information as possible, such as license plate numbers or photos. We will look into your concerns.

However, please keep in mind that people staying at 71 Vista Montaña have a strong incentive to comply with our code of conduct. They can be removed from the site if they break the rules. We respectfully ask people who live in the area to avoid jumping to conclusions regarding their new neighbors. Based on our experience with other Safe Parking sites, most of the participants have a sincere desire to do the right thing as they work to rebuild their lives."

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



**Fw: Safe Distance of homeless RV parking site**

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

Tue 9/28/2021 10:10 AM

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

**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:** Angee Yang <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 10:41 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Safe Distance of homeless RV parking site

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

[External Email]

Hi all,

We heard there is a rule for safe distance of homeless RV parking site against kids' parks. The 71 Vista Montana site is not meeting that rule. May we know why this site passed this rule? We don't know the background of these RV users/owners. Though we have sympathy towards the unhoused group, we are also very worried if this site might attract more unregulatable people to station here whom the city has records of relocation challenges. Please stop this project before bad things happen.

YC

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

**Fw: Upfront community communication is a MUST**

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

Tue 9/28/2021 10:10 AM

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

**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:** Angee Yang <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 10:57 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Upfront community communication is a MUST

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

[External Email]

Hi all,

We want to address our upset of being ignored before the city made the decision to open 71 Vista Montana as the homeless RV parking site. As one of the residents lives very close to this site, we deserved to be thoroughly communicated in detail with a more organized long term plan. We are happy to see more and more young families live in this neighborhood with adorable kids. A safe environment without worry is the most important concern for this community. Please be thoughtful as you are representing us people in this city.

Regards,  
YC & CF

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

**Fw: Kids' Safety: Distance of homeless RV parking site**

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

Tue 9/28/2021 10:10 AM

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

**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:** Allan Yeh <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 12:39 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Kids' Safety: Distance of homeless RV parking site

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

[External Email]

Hi city clerks,

We do not appreciate the decision made by SJCC to open the 71 Vista Montana location as a homeless RV parking site which does not meet the requirement of keeping a safe distances of kids' parks. Looks like SJCC purposely ignored this rule and executed this homeless RV parking program. We asked many questions but not proper replies from City of SJ. Your ignorance showed that you knew this would be an unwelcomed project and yet you still executed it even breaking the safety distance rule. Please stop this project until you have the intact plan with thorough consideration for both this neighborhood and those legit unhoused groups. BTW, we don't appreciate the side effect of this site attracting ruthless bad people to this neighborhood.

A worried neighbor

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

**Fw: Homeless RV safe parking site**

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

Tue 9/28/2021 10:10 AM

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

**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:** chao chun <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:52 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Homeless RV safe parking site

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

[External Email]

To the City Councils and Major,

Please do not just ignore us and try to let the time weigh it out for the wrong decision made/executed regarding the homeless RV parking site assigned to 71 Vista Montana. This is a promising neighborhood that excitingly resided with many nice families with young kids. We understand there are unhoused people who need help. If you did a good investigation and planning, then communicated before the decision was made with guarantee that this site would not attract any misconducting people to worry the neighborhood; the community wouldn't be so disappointed. It's so badly executed --> notice from SJCC was too short, 9-month is too long, this site location is NOT safe-distance enough from a kids' playground, and this site itself is not inhabitable for those unhoused people who really need help. Please stop this homeless RV parking site now until the city finds the real solution.

Regards,  
Yokohalu

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

**Fw: Citizens for Safe RV Camps**

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

Tue 9/28/2021 10:10 AM

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

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 10:07 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Citizens for Safe RV Camps**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:** Tom Doherty <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 9:23 AM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>**Cc:** Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov>; [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>  
david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Kimberly Lain <[REDACTED]>**Subject:** Citizens for Safe RV Camps

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

[External Email]

Agenda item #6 - PUBLIC ISSUES

I am a resident of the Vista Montana/Renaissance community and I want the Supervisors to know that the city of San Jose has placed a Pilot RV Safe Parking in our residential neighborhood. I am concerned about a lack of safety, lack of transparency, code violations like needle, garbage, etc. I am asking for the county to intervene to shut down this pilot program. Also, I oppose increasing any funding to HomeFirst in Item 72.

\*Agenda Item #20 \*- I am in support of LifeMoves being supported financially to find sites that will have actual structures with running water, electricity, bathrooms and showers to house the homeless. Keep in mind that when you find the sites I also support that both the county and LifeMoves notify any residents that live in the area within 10 days of identifying the site, that if the site is contaminated that it is cleaned up before allowing human being to live on it, that sites be located a minimum of 1000 feet from playgrounds, schools, childcares, nurseries, residential houses AND finally that as a provider LifeMoves works diligently to help homeless get into permanent housing. We do not want you to repeat the horrific situation at 71 Vista Montana where the unhoused are living on arsenic contaminated land and the city chose to placed the site inches away from a child's playground and play structure.

Agenda Item #32 (Optional):

Due to the irresponsible and reckless handling of 71 Vista Montana, it is evident that HomeFirst lacks capacity - even after receiving millions from Apple - to ramp up and handle any additional contracts or sites. Myself and our community recommend that the board terminate the contract and items #32 and not increase the funding proposed in item #72.

**Sincerely,**

**Thomas E Doherty**

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

## Fw: Comparison of Safe RV Parking with a Better Run Site

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Wed 9/29/2021 9:28 AM

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

## 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:** Sheena Madan <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 11:34 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjosegov <Matt.mahan@sanjosegov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]  
<[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Comparison of Safe RV Parking with a Better Run Site

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

[External Email]

City Councilmembers and Supervisor Lee,

Despite our neighbors talking about all the issues with the 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking site, I see you acting like it's this great feat.

**Do you realize this is just an extremely expensive contaminated parking lot with porta potties?!  
.. and adjacent to our children's playground!**



There are no amenities, no services, no oversight, no way to get unhoused people the support they need to get back on their feet. Trash and junk vehicles are accumulating on property that cost \$22.5 million and has a chance to hold up the property with injunctions for years, as has happened in other cities.

Where is the accountability and oversight? This site costs \$400K for 9 months. Even at full capacity, this is \$20K per person (2X as expensive as Hope Village) for basically nothing! We've seen that there is frequently no one on site, no occupants, NO SECURITY GUARDS). There are clearly no services or amenities. Where is all this money going and why aren't you bothering to find out?

Oh, the answer is that HomeFirst is grossly mismanaging the site and we neighbors who live less than 100 yds away can clearly see all the issues but have no recourse.

These homeless people deserve better and we deserve better. **Please shut this site down and find an appropriate site with facilities, NOT right next to child-sensitive areas.**

Here is a direct comparison of this site with one that offers the type of wraparound services San Jose should be trying to match to actually help these people.

	<b>71 Vista Montana, San Jose</b>	<b>1000 Hillview Ct, Milpitas</b>
At the end of the program, participants get	<b>NOTHING</b>	<b>Section 8 Voucher after 1 year stay</b>
Amenities for participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 porta-potties</li> </ul> <b>NO running water</b> <b>NO natural gas</b> <b>NO propane</b> <b>NO support to get utilities</b> <b>NO way to dump gray water</b>	<b>Indoors!</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Running water</li> <li>• Bathrooms</li> <li>• Kitchenettes</li> <li>• Climate controlled</li> </ul>
Residential suitability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arsenic contaminated land unsuitable for residential use <a href="http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic">http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic</a></li> <li>• Zoned for commercial use</li> </ul>	<b>Already a motel and zoned for people staying there</b>
Case-worker qualifications	<b>HomeFirst requires</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only 2 years experience (no degree required!)</li> <li>• High-turnover</li> </ul>	<b>Abode non-profit has</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 year Bachelor's required</li> <li>• Plus additional experience</li> </ul>
Case-worker access	<b>Occasional appearance?</b>	<b>Work from portable buildings on site</b>
Community rooms	<b>none</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community kitchen</li> <li>• Laundry</li> <li>• Multipurpose rooms</li> <li>• Counseling rooms</li> <li>• Case management offices</li> <li>• Wellness classes</li> <li>• Educational programs</li> </ul>

Distance from Park	<b>TWO FEET</b>	<b>1000 ft</b>
Distance from Closest Residence	<b>TWO FEET</b>	<b>600 ft</b>
Staff experienced in dealing with this population	<b>Only UNTRAINED security guards on site (when present at all)</b>	<b>Fully trained case managers on site</b>

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

**Fw: Secure Your Representative's YES Vote on Infrastructure TODAY**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 11:35 AM

**To:** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>

**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:** National League of Cities (NLC) <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 11:01 AM

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

**Subject:** Secure Your Representative's YES Vote on Infrastructure TODAY

[External Email]

Send a letter to your Congressional delegation with just a few clicks!



**Dear NLC Member,**

America's cities, towns, and villages know infrastructure is a job worth doing.

**Join NLC and your fellow city leaders in ensuring that your Member of Congress is voting "YES" on infrastructure this week!**

Right now, Congress is wrestling with many important issues, but after more than half a decade of NLC calling for Congressional support for infrastructure, the House is on the precipice of their vote on Thursday to pass the **bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)** that invests in our transportation, water, and broadband infrastructure with us. This is the **final step** before the infrastructure bill heads to the President's desk for his signature, and it's because of cities' advocacy that it has made it this far!

**Every Representative's vote matters this time**, which is why we need you to speak up. In less than five minutes, you can review the template letter [here](#) to make sure your views are clear and send to Congress as they make their final decision to vote for the IIJA or you can be connected to any Congressional office by calling [REDACTED]

[Click Here to Send a Letter](#)

---

### Helpful NLC Links:

[Articles](#)

[Upcoming Events](#)

[Resources & Training](#)

[Advocacy](#)



If this message is not displaying properly, please view the [online version](#).



You may opt out of email communications from NLC at any time. Update your [communication preferences](#).

This message was intended for: cityclerk@sanjoseca.gov

[REDACTED]  
[Privacy Policy](#) | © 2021 NLC, All Rights Reserved

Powered by [Higher Logic](#)

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

**Fw: Community Forest Management Plan**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 10:28 AM

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

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 9:24 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** FW: Community Forest Management Plan

---

**From:** Bob Levy <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 8:08 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>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>**Cc:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Community Forest Management Plan

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

[External Email]

Honorable Mayor and Council Members,

Attached is a letter signed by a coalition of office holders, community leaders, and environmental groups explaining why we find the draft Community Forest Management Plan and the process for developing the plan inadequate. We concur with Cal Fire, the plan's primary sponsor, who describes the document as "woefully underperformed". We respectfully request that you halt the current process and reinstitute a process that does an effective job of engaging community stakeholders.

Thank you for allowing your office to meet with members of our coalition. We appreciated the opportunity to express our perspective and answer any questions your office had. If there is any additional information we can provide you with please do not hesitate to contact [Vicki Moore](#).

Respectfully yours,  
Bob Levy

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

# Coalition to Advance Urban Forestry in San José

September 23, 2021

San José Mayor & City Council  
City of San José  
200 E. Santa Clara Street  
San José, CA 95113

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

Thank you for meeting with us concerning the initial draft of the San José Draft Community Forest Management Plan (Plan) which was described by the project funder, CAL FIRE, as “woefully underperformed”. CAL FIRE pointed out many omissions and deficiencies, including failure to meaningfully engage key stakeholders. Recently, a revised 95% version was released in August and, while many corrections have been made, **it still omits serious issues impacting our urban forest - issues that warrant attention and consideration.**

The fundamental issue that allowed these omissions to occur remains: the Draft Plan had no external stakeholder engagement process. The Draft is therefore incomplete, lacking in transparency, and incapable of guiding decision makers forward. Its limited scope and lack of inclusivity reflect the document’s focus on only the small portion of the urban forest within the City’s jurisdiction, rather than the entire urban forest that is mostly managed and financed by others.

As stated in our earlier letter, ownership and management of San José’s urban forest is the responsibility of many entities, and a solid plan for its future depends on engagement of these stakeholders. The vast majority of any urban forest - as much as 85% - is managed and financed by non-City entities. Street trees and park trees comprise the smaller portion, and in San José, even street trees are not the responsibility of the City, but of adjacent property owners. The cross-jurisdictional nature of urban forest management makes it imperative to have a stakeholder group representing many jurisdictions. In turn, implementation buy-in and investment is ensured.

The role of key external stakeholders, including the value of their impacts on environmental, economic, and health indicators, are mostly absent in the Draft Plan. These include Santa Clara County, Valley Water, Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority, Caltrans, San José Unified School District among other districts, major corporate landholders, and CAL FIRE itself. PG&E is also an impactful stakeholder due to its management responsibilities. This is a rare opportunity to create buy-in of best practices from entities with significant influence over a valuable asset we all share and benefit from.

As before, we implore you to address this matter by directing DOT to pause this process. We ask you to ensure the formation of a steering committee of independent and diverse external stakeholders to drive robust community engagement, bring in urban forestry experts, and steer the development of a true community plan that is visionary and state-of-the-art. This committee can use the Draft Plan as the starting point from which to draw in external stakeholder expertise and perspective and eventually expand and shape the Plan to reflect the needs of the entire urban forest and its stakeholders.

The recent scattershot community outreach approach by DOT that has occurred over the past three months to “just get it done” is simply not adequate—it’s way too little too late. They have merely sent out a detailed technical plan to thousands on various city mailing lists of both organizations and individuals, calling everyone a “stakeholder”, when these are not stakeholders with major asset responsibilities, expertise, and resources that can benefit San Jose’s urban forest. This approach hits far below any standard we believe San José should be willing to accept.

A key issue also inadequately covered in the 95% draft is San Jose’s tree inequity problem which is a crucially important environmental justice issue. Lack of tree canopy has a significant impact on human health and health equity and research has proven that the urban forest, in and of itself, is a public health tool. While some neighborhoods have a healthy tree canopy and benefit from cooler summer air temperatures, reduced air pollution, and decreased stress, others have a relatively sparse tree canopy and suffer from significantly hotter temperatures, high levels of air particulates and related disease, and depressed looking streets. While outside funders have done much to address tree inequity within San José, a lot more work needs to be done – and that work begins with the creation of an authentic stakeholder committee that will turn this draft into a plan with a *shared vision for all*, along with collaborative, SMART goals and strategies to achieve that vision.

San José deserves a plan that reflects the wisdom and availability of the immense expertise and resources all around us. By pulling together to tap these, San José can have an inspiring, cutting-edge community forestry plan that is also a climate action model for cities across the nation.

Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dave Cortese  
*California State Senator, Senate District 15*

Linda J. LeZotte  
*Director, Valley Water and Former City of San José Councilmember*



Vicki Moore  
*Chair, Santa Clara County Planning Commission*

Bob Levy  
*Santa Clara County Planning Commissioner and Former City of San Jose Planning Commissioner*

Michelle Yesney  
*Former City of San José Planning Commissioner; Former City of S.J. Director of the Office of Environmental Management; Former President, Greenbelt Alliance*

Fernando R. Zazueta  
*Past President, La Raza Historical Society of Santa Clara Valley*

Christina Egan  
*Volunteer Services Manager, Santa Clara Valley Medical Center*

Barbara Marshman  
*Former Mercury News Editorial Page Editor*

Nicole Kemeny  
*President, 350 Silicon Valley*

Susan Butler-Graham  
*Team Coordinator, Mothers Out Front*

Alice Kaufman  
*Director of Advocacy, Green Foothills*

Justin Wang  
*Advocacy Manager, Greenbelt Alliance*

Irma Balderas  
*Chair, Our City Forest Board of Directors*

Rita Norton  
*Former Chair, SCVWD Environmental Advisory Committee*

Gladwyn d'Souza

*Chair, Conservation Committee, Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club*

Deb Kramer

*Executive Director, Keep Coyote Creek Beautiful*

Elizabeth Sarmiento

*Board Member, Smart Yards Education*

Peri Plantenberg

*Coordinator, Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action*



**DAVE CORTESE**  
REPRESENTING SENATE DISTRICT 15

SILICON VALLEY  
YOUTH CLIMATE ACTION



KEEP  
COYOTE  
CREEK  
BEAUTIFUL



**Coalition to Advance Urban Forestry in San José**

**Fw: Community Forest Management Plan**

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

Mon 9/27/2021 4:12 PM

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

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 3:44 PM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Community Forest Management Plan**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:** Bob Levy <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:14 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>**Cc:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Community Forest Management Plan

[External Email]

Honorable Mayor and Council Members,

Attached is a letter signed by a coalition of office holders, community leaders, and environmental groups explaining why we find the draft Community Forest Management Plan and the process for developing the plan inadequate. We concur with Cal Fire, the plan's primary sponsor, who describes the document as "woefully underperformed". We respectfully request that you halt the current process and reinitiate a process that does an effective job of engaging community stakeholders.

Thank you for allowing your office to meet with members of our coalition. We appreciated the opportunity to express our perspective and answer any questions your office had. If there is any additional information we can provide you with please do not hesitate to contact [Vicki Moore](#).

Respectfully yours,  
Bob Levy

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

# Coalition to Advance Urban Forestry in San José

September 23, 2021

San José Mayor & City Council  
City of San José  
200 E. Santa Clara Street  
San José, CA 95113

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

Thank you for meeting with us concerning the initial draft of the San José Draft Community Forest Management Plan (Plan) which was described by the project funder, CAL FIRE, as “woefully underperformed”. CAL FIRE pointed out many omissions and deficiencies, including failure to meaningfully engage key stakeholders. Recently, a revised 95% version was released in August and, while many corrections have been made, **it still omits serious issues impacting our urban forest - issues that warrant attention and consideration.**

The fundamental issue that allowed these omissions to occur remains: the Draft Plan had no external stakeholder engagement process. The Draft is therefore incomplete, lacking in transparency, and incapable of guiding decision makers forward. Its limited scope and lack of inclusivity reflect the document’s focus on only the small portion of the urban forest within the City’s jurisdiction, rather than the entire urban forest that is mostly managed and financed by others.

As stated in our earlier letter, ownership and management of San José’s urban forest is the responsibility of many entities, and a solid plan for its future depends on engagement of these stakeholders. The vast majority of any urban forest - as much as 85% - is managed and financed by non-City entities. Street trees and park trees comprise the smaller portion, and in San José, even street trees are not the responsibility of the City, but of adjacent property owners. The cross-jurisdictional nature of urban forest management makes it imperative to have a stakeholder group representing many jurisdictions. In turn, implementation buy-in and investment is ensured.

The role of key external stakeholders, including the value of their impacts on environmental, economic, and health indicators, are mostly absent in the Draft Plan. These include Santa Clara County, Valley Water, Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority, Caltrans, San José Unified School District among other districts, major corporate landholders, and CAL FIRE itself. PG&E is also an impactful stakeholder due to its management responsibilities. This is a rare opportunity to create buy-in of best practices from entities with significant influence over a valuable asset we all share and benefit from.

As before, we implore you to address this matter by directing DOT to pause this process. We ask you to ensure the formation of a steering committee of independent and diverse external stakeholders to drive robust community engagement, bring in urban forestry experts, and steer the development of a true community plan that is visionary and state-of-the-art. This committee can use the Draft Plan as the starting point from which to draw in external stakeholder expertise and perspective and eventually expand and shape the Plan to reflect the needs of the entire urban forest and its stakeholders.

The recent scattershot community outreach approach by DOT that has occurred over the past three months to “just get it done” is simply not adequate—it’s way too little too late. They have merely sent out a detailed technical plan to thousands on various city mailing lists of both organizations and individuals, calling everyone a “stakeholder”, when these are not stakeholders with major asset responsibilities, expertise, and resources that can benefit San Jose’s urban forest. This approach hits far below any standard we believe San José should be willing to accept.

A key issue also inadequately covered in the 95% draft is San Jose’s tree inequity problem which is a crucially important environmental justice issue. Lack of tree canopy has a significant impact on human health and health equity and research has proven that the urban forest, in and of itself, is a public health tool. While some neighborhoods have a healthy tree canopy and benefit from cooler summer air temperatures, reduced air pollution, and decreased stress, others have a relatively sparse tree canopy and suffer from significantly hotter temperatures, high levels of air particulates and related disease, and depressed looking streets. While outside funders have done much to address tree inequity within San José, a lot more work needs to be done – and that work begins with the creation of an authentic stakeholder committee that will turn this draft into a plan with a *shared vision for all*, along with collaborative, SMART goals and strategies to achieve that vision.

San José deserves a plan that reflects the wisdom and availability of the immense expertise and resources all around us. By pulling together to tap these, San José can have an inspiring, cutting-edge community forestry plan that is also a climate action model for cities across the nation.

Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dave Cortese  
*California State Senator, Senate District 15*

Linda J. LeZotte  
*Director, Valley Water and Former City of San José Councilmember*

Vicki Moore  
*Chair, Santa Clara County Planning Commission*

Bob Levy  
*Santa Clara County Planning Commissioner and Former City of San Jose Planning Commissioner*

Michelle Yesney  
*Former City of San José Planning Commissioner; Former City of S.J. Director of the Office of Environmental Management; Former President, Greenbelt Alliance*

Fernando R. Zazueta  
*Past President, La Raza Historical Society of Santa Clara Valley*

Christina Egan  
*Volunteer Services Manager, Santa Clara Valley Medical Center*

Barbara Marshman  
*Former Mercury News Editorial Page Editor*

Nicole Kemeny  
*President, 350 Silicon Valley*

Susan Butler-Graham  
*Team Coordinator, Mothers Out Front*

Alice Kaufman  
*Director of Advocacy, Green Foothills*

Justin Wang  
*Advocacy Manager, Greenbelt Alliance*

Irma Balderas  
*Chair, Our City Forest Board of Directors*

Rita Norton  
*Former Chair, SCVWD Environmental Advisory Committee*



Gladwyn d'Souza

*Chair, Conservation Committee, Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club*

Deb Kramer

*Executive Director, Keep Coyote Creek Beautiful*

Elizabeth Sarmiento

*Board Member, Smart Yards Education*

Peri Plantenberg

*Coordinator, Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action*



**DAVE CORTESE**  
REPRESENTING SENATE DISTRICT 15

SILICON VALLEY  
**YOUTH CLIMATE ACTION**



KEEP  
COYOTE  
CREEK  
BEAUTIFUL



**Coalition to Advance Urban Forestry in San José**

**Fw: 71 Vista Montana site**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:36 AM

**To:** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov> 1 attachments (177 KB)

Vista Montana Temporary Safe Parking FAQ updated 9.29.2021.pdf;

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:45 PM

**To:** Sri Cha <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Perez, Raul <Raul.Perez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: 71 Vista Montana site

Hello Srinath,

In an effort to communicate updated information to residents and to address observations, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,

Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**From:** Sri Cha <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 10:27 AM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov; [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** 71 Vista Montana site

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

[External Email]

Hello

As a concerned San Jose resident for 14 years, I would like to bring to your attention 2 concerns.

**1) Gross Mismanagement:**

71 Vista Montaña is not suitable as a Safe RV housing site for the following reasons:

- The property has dangerously high levels of arsenic <http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic>. Inspection revealed it is uninhabitable for residential use
- There are no wraparound services: no health clinics nearby, only underqualified case-workers (no degree required!) offering sporadic support
- There is no access to real bathrooms, no running water -- only two portapotties
- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are not trained for this population, unlike case workers
- It is **TWO FEET away from a children's park** and residences

\$400K for 9 months is a gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
  - (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though David Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be there)
- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive at HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!
- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
- There's a dead car battery sitting on top of a recycling can

- A can of paint was dumped next to the site
- We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site
- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

## 2) Broken Promises

- This is marketed as RV parking, yet several of the vehicles parked are pickup trucks or vans
- Very few people are living there
- Cohen told us it is only for Apple sites but someone from the Coleman encampment was allowed into the program on the first day
- There are supposed to be two security guards there 24/7, but we've only seen one at a time. There is also an empty patrol car parked
- Cars do not appear operational. They were towed in and one person was seen working under the hood of the car on what seems to be a failed oil change.
  - If not operational, now do they get more fuel for generators or cooking or dump their gray water?

The 71 Vista Montaña needs to be shut down NOW before more money is wasted in a program that seems lose-lose-lose for the neighbors, the homeless people, and the city.

**How in your good conscience can allow this happen?**

Srinath

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect



exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

**Fw: homeless encampment in the children's playground**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:36 AM

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

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:35 PM

**To:** Rajasekar N <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: homeless encampment in the children's playground

Hello – in an effort to communicate updated information to residents and to address observations, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,  
Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**From:** Rajasekar N <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:07 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** homeless encampment in the children's playground

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

[External Email]

Subject: RV parking site at 71 Vista Montana - affecting safety in layout, kids safety

Dear city council,

The so called "safe" RV parking site that you moved to this tightly packed neighborhood is turning out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing every week. The latest is oil spilled on the ground, rags, bucket of oil left carelessly on the "safe" parking site. There was also fresh paint dumped on curb, and a broken alcohol bottle! (We have photos to prove all these).

The people whom the city has moved here has history of being irresponsible at the Apple site - causing multiple fires and trashing the entire location. City moved these people into the midst of this dense neighborhood feet away from residences and a kids park. I cannot believe that the city believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight!

And, the city is being proven wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner - it was no mis-calculated timing, he started and moved after the red light. This was at a crosswalk usually almost always occupied by pedestrians

Last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Neither the of conduct is being followed by the residents, not is it being enforced by the security. Residents also saw a person on the play equipment in the kids park smoking weed.

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what city thinks! That means the city doesn't even know stays here!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration.

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly, has a history of having caused fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped city is with tiny fire extinguishers!

This site, which you call "safe" parking site - is literally the opposite. You have put people who have proven themselves to be irresponsible in the midst of this community with your only hope being them sticking to a code of conduct. And they are proving themselves to be not able to that week after week.

I request you to put an end to this unsafe site as soon as you can

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

**How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

**Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

**How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

**Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

**Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

**Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

**Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

**Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

**Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

**What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

**Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.



**Fw: Questions about 71 Vista Montana's future**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:36 AM

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

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:38 PM

**To:** Karthik Suresh <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Questions about 71 Vista Montana's future

Hello Karthik,

In an effort to communicate updated information to residents, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document that incorporates answers to additional questions that we have received; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,  
Rosalynn

---

**From:** Karthik Suresh <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 11:56 AM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam

<Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn  
<Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4  
<District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>;  
Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Questions about 71 Vista Montana's future

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

[External Email]

Dear SJCC members and colleagues

As a resident of North San Jose adjacent to the 71 Vista Montana we have been seeking answers but have been given a run around for answers. The request for public records has been delayed and based on the email I received there seems to be hesitation in providing information, which if true should support everything that has been shared by SJCC so far. However, I'd like to seek some specific answers to questions we have been asking but are still waiting for a direct response-

1. Which committee/council/set of individuals made the decision to use this site? We understand this was treated as an emergency used but its been almost a month the site was opened but there must be some entity that proposed this site to be the best option vs the Gold St site.
2. It'll soon be 11% of the duration the site was intended for its original use. What plans has SJCC executed to get the RV residents into permanent housing? What progress has been made to find an alternate site as mentioned by Councilman David Cohen.
3. How is the City planning to communicate with the neighborhood residents? The City has executed RV safe parking and plans a 500+ affordable housing unit without considering the lack of safety or street parking problems we face. How can we collaborate to ensure our inputs are considered so that this neighborhood doesn't deteriorate?
4. With the winters approaching, what is the City doing to provide heating to the RV residents without using generators or any other means that will worsen the air quality in the neighborhood?

Thanks,  
Karthik

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

**Fw: Questions: regarding so called "safe" RV park**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:36 AM

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

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:33 PM

**To:** k panikka <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Questions: regarding so called "safe" RV park

Hello – attached is an updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document that addresses points you raise in your email, as well as answers to questions we have received from many residents. Neighbors may contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,  
Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)



**From:** k panikka <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:19 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Questions: regarding so called "safe" RV park

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

[External Email]

Please answer:

1. Which committee/council/set of individuals made the decision to use this site? We understand that an EOC was used but its been almost a month since the site opened but we still do not have answers
2. It'll soon be 11% of the duration the site was intended for its original use. What plans has SJCC executed to get the RV residents into permanent housing? What progress has been made to find an alternate site as mentioned by Councilman David Cohen.
3. How is the City planning to communicate with the neighborhood residents? The City has executed RV safe parking and plans a 500+ affordable housing unit without considering the lack of safety or street parking. How can we collaborate to ensure our inputs are considered so that this neighborhood doesn't deteriorate?
4. With the winters approaching what is the city doing to provide heating to the RV residents without using generators or any other means that will worsen the air quality in the neighborhood ?

Has any of this being thought through?

Thanks

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



## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

**How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

**Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

**How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

**Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

**Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

## Fw: 09/27 -- 71 Vista Montaña RV parking site experiment is not the right place in middle of 5000+ residents with kids, pets and families

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 9/30/2021 9:36 AM

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

### 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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:29 PM

**To:** prashant maloo <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: 09/27 -- 71 Vista Montaña RV parking site experiment is not the right place in middle of 5000+ residents with kids, pets and families

Hello Prashant,

In an effort to communicate updated information to residents and to address observations, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,  
Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**From:** prashant maloo <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 12:49 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** 09/27 -- 71 Vista Montaña RV parking site experiment is not the right place in middle of 5000+ residents with kids, pets and families

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

[External Email]

Hello,

71 Vista Montaña is not suitable as a Safe RV housing site for the following reasons:

- The property has dangerously high levels of arsenic <http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic>. Inspection revealed it is uninhabitable for residential use
- There are no wraparound services: no health clinics nearby, only underqualified case-workers (no degree required!) offering sporadic support
- There is no access to real bathrooms, no running water -- only two portapotties
- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on-site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are not trained for this population, unlike caseworkers
- It is TWO FEET away from a children's park and residences

\$400K for 9 months is gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
  - (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be there)
- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive at HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!
- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
  - There's a dead car battery sitting on top of a recycling can
  - A can of paint was dumped next to the site
  - We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site

- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

The 71 Vista Montaña needs to be shut down NOW before more money is wasted in a program that seems lose-lose-lose for the neighbors, the homeless people, and the city.

Thanks,  
Prashant

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City



monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

## Fw: RV parking site - safety concerns, mismanagement and depriving kids of safe open space.

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 9/30/2021 9:36 AM

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

### 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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:28 PM

**To:** Sunil Palacherla <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: RV parking site - safety concerns, mismanagement and depriving kids of safe open space.

Hello Sunil,

In an effort to communicate updated information to residents and to address observations, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,  
Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**From:** Sunil Palacherla <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 1:00 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov; [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** RV parking site - safety concerns, mismanagement and depriving kids of safe open space.

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

[External Email]

Dear city council,

**Your actions of creating a Safe parking site at 71 vista montana** have resulted in:

1. **Gross negligence** of public safety of the already heavily populated community
2. **Misuse** of tax dollars
3. **Irresponsible public servants** - not involving the community

To rectify these we, as a community, suggest you **move the site into city hall** which is much more cost effective, and has all the amenities, for the health and well being of the campers.

**Results** are far from what you have presented to the public.

**Reality** : The 71 Vista Montaña needs to be shut down NOW before more money is wasted in a program that seems lose-lose-lose for the neighbors, the homeless people, and the city.

This site, which you call "safe" parking site - is literally the opposite. You have put people who have proven themselves to be irresponsible in the midst of this community with your only hope being them sticking to a code of conduct. And they are proving themselves to be not able to that week after week.

71 Vista Montaña is not suitable as a Safe RV housing site for the following reasons:

- The property has dangerously **high levels of arsenic** <http://tinyurl.com/vistaarsenic>. Inspection revealed it is uninhabitable for residential use
- There are no wraparound services: no health clinics nearby, only underqualified case-workers (no degree required!) offering sporadic support
- There is no access to real bathrooms, no running water -- only two portapotties
- No amenities such as laundry, kitchenette, educational programs
- The two security guards supposedly on site (we've only ever seen one despite repeated assurances of 2 guards 24/7) are not trained for this population, unlike case workers
- It is TWO FEET away from a children's park and residences

**\$400K for 9 months is a gross mismanagement of funds for basically a toxic parking lot and landfill storage:**

- There is possibly only ONE person living there
- (And he's from the Coleman encampment even though Cohen said only Apple encampment people should be

there)

- Even at full (20 ppl) capacity, this is more than TWICE as expensive at HOPE Village for only 9 months instead of a year... still with no amenities!
- Many of the participants have left their vehicles there while they are using a motel voucher, turning this into just a parking lot and DOUBLE DIPPING into city-offered resources
- Trash is already accumulating
  - We can see an oil change attempt not cleaned up: oil spilled over the pavement, rag soaked in it, bucket of black oil, funnel lying 20 feet away
  - We could see ten bags of trash on top of the RV from our playground; we complained and they put a tarp on it and moved some next to the vehicle
  - There's a dead car battery sitting on top of a recycling can
  - A can of paint was dumped next to the site
  - We see parts of broken alcohol bottles inside the site
- There are trailers with no livable vehicles nearby, just storage
- This is on property that cost \$22.5 million and injunctions from the program participants could easily hold up the city's other designs for the property

The so called "safe" RV parking site that you moved to this tightly packed neighborhood is turning out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing every week. The latest is oil spilled on the ground, rags, bucket of oil left carelessly on the "safe" parking site. There was also fresh paint dumped on curb, and a broken alcohol bottle! (We have photos to prove all these).

The people whom the city has moved here has history of being irresponsible at the Apple site - causing multiple fires and trashing the entire location. City moved these people into the midst of this dense neighborhood feet away from residences and a kids park. I cannot believe that the city believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight!

And, the city is being proven wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner - it was no mis-calculated timing, he started and moved after the red light. This was at a crosswalk usually almost always occupied by pedestrians

Last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Neither the conduct is being followed by the residents, not is it being enforced by the security. Residents also saw a person on the play equipment in the kids park smoking weed.

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what city thinks! That means the city doesn't even know stays here!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration.

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly, has a history of having caused fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped city is with tiny fire extinguishers!

**As responsible elected public servants you should make sure that homelessness is dealt with equitably, primary focus being health and safety of the rest of the community.**

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City



monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security



- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

**Fw: 71 vista montana safe parking issues**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:37 AM

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

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:22 PM**To:** shree vas <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Ho, Wendy &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

Brown, Stacey &lt;Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; District4 &lt;District4@sanjoseca.gov&gt;;

[REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt; david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov &lt;david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Burton, Chris &lt;Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky &lt;Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Liccardo, Sam &lt;sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Jones, Chappie &lt;Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Jimenez, Sergio &lt;sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Peralez, Raul &lt;Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Cohen, David &lt;David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Carrasco, Magdalena &lt;Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Davis, Dev &lt;dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Esparza, Maya &lt;Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Arenas, Sylvia &lt;sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Foley, Pam &lt;Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; [REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt; [REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

Ho, Wendy &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

Brown, Stacey

&lt;Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; District4 &lt;District4@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; [REDACTED] &lt;[REDACTED]&gt;

&lt;[REDACTED]&gt; City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Nguyen, Lam &lt;Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Safe Parking &lt;Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; City Clerk &lt;city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Nguyen, Lam &lt;Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov&gt;; Safe Parking &lt;Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov&gt;

**Subject:** RE: 71 vista montana safe parking issues

Hello Sryvas,

In an effort to communicate updated information to residents and to address observations, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the

Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,  
Rosallynn

### Rosallynn Hughey

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosallynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosallynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**From:** shree vas <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 1:55 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosallynn <Rosallynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosallynn <Rosallynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; 71VistaMontana@gmail.com; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** 71 vista montana safe parking issues

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

[External Email]

- This is marketed as RV parking, yet several of the vehicles parked are pickup trucks or vans
- Very few people are living there
- Cohen told us it is only for Apple sites but someone from the Coleman encampment was allowed into the program on the first day
- There are supposed to be two security guards there 24/7, but we've only seen one at a time. There is also an empty patrol car parked

- Cars do not appear operational. They were towed in and one person was seen working under the hood of the car on what seems to be a failed oil change.
- If not operational, now do they get more fuel for generators or cooking or dump their gray water?
- Which committee/council/set of individuals made the decision to use this site? We understand that an EOC was used but its been almost a month since the site opened but we still do not have answers
- It'll soon be 11% of the duration the site was intended for its original use. What plans has SJCC executed to get the RV residents into permanent housing? What progress has been made to find an alternate site as mentioned by Councilman David Cohen.
- How is the City planning to communicate with the neighborhood residents? The City has executed RV safe parking and plans a 500+ affordable housing unit without considering the lack of safety or street parking. How can we collaborate to ensure our inputs are considered so that this neighborhood doesn't deteriorate?
- With the winters approaching what is the city doing to provide heating to the RV residents without using generators or any other means that will worsen the air quality in the neighborhood ?

Sryvas

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security



- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect



exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

**Fw: 71 Vista Montana**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:37 AM

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

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:17 PM

**To:** Jennifer Cheung <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: 71 Vista Montana

Hello Jennifer,

In an effort to communicate updated information to residents and to address observations, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document; please see attached. Neighbors may

also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,  
Rosallynn

Rosallynn Hughey  
Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager  
Cell: [REDACTED]  
[rosallynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosallynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)  
City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113  
[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | facebook | twitter

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

From: Jennifer Cheung <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 2:09 PM  
To: [david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov); Burton, Chris <[Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov)>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <[Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov)>; Liccardo, Sam <[sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov)>; Jones, Chappie <[Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov)>; Jimenez, Sergio <[sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov)>; Peralez, Raul <[Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov)>; Cohen, David <[David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov)>; Carrasco, Magdalena <[Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov)>; Davis, Dev <[dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov)>; Esparza, Maya <[Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov)>; Arenas, Sylvia <[sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov)>; Foley, Pam <[Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov)>; Mahan, Matt <[Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov)>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosallynn <[Rosallynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Rosallynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov)>; Brown, Stacey <[Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov)>; District4 <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>; [REDACTED] [david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov); Burton, Chris <[Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov)>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <[Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov)>; Liccardo, Sam <[sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov)>; Jones, Chappie <[Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov)>; Jimenez, Sergio <[sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov)>; Peralez, Raul <[Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov)>; Cohen, David <[David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov)>; Carrasco, Magdalena <[Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov)>; Davis, Dev <[dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov)>; Esparza, Maya <[Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov)>; Arenas, Sylvia <[sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov)>; Foley, Pam <[Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov)>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosallynn <[Rosallynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Rosallynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov)>; Brown, Stacey <[Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov)>; District4 <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>; Nguyen, Lam <[Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov)>; Safe Parking <[Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov)>; City Clerk <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>; Nguyen, Lam <[Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov)>; Safe Parking <[Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov)>  
Subject: 71 Vista Montana

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

[External Email]

Dear city council,

As the parent of a 3.5 year old daughter, I am concerned with the lack of communication or responsiveness toward the residents in this neighborhood. I grew up in Los Angeles and am no stranger to homelessness; I'm not necessarily "afraid" or "scared" of homeless people. My concerns are listed below as it appears that the city is attempting to make an appearance as to how they are curbing homelessness, yet providing these homeless people with little more than a parking lot (no indoor facilities, plumbing, running water, etc). This location helps no one.

The so called "safe" RV parking site that you moved to this tightly packed neighborhood is turning out to be a safety risk with clear open danger signs showing every week. The latest is oil spilled on the ground, rags, bucket of oil left carelessly on the "safe" parking site. There was also fresh paint dumped on curb, and a broken alcohol bottle!

The people whom the city has moved here has a history of being irresponsible at the Apple site - causing multiple fires and trashing the entire location. City moved these people into the midst of this dense neighborhood feet away from residences and a kids park. I cannot believe that the city believes that these people will turn to be good samaritans overnight!

And, the city is being proven wrong week after week. The very first week, we saw a truck coming out of this site run a red light in a egregious manner - it was no mis-calculated timing, he started and moved after the red light. This was at a crosswalk usually almost always occupied by pedestrians

Last week, residents saw trash strewn on a large area of the parking lot in two locations. Neither the of conduct is being followed by the residents, not is it being enforced by the security. Residents also saw a person on the play equipment in the kids park smoking weed.

There is also the additional issue of not knowing who is at the site. Residents talked to a person at the site who is not from the original Apple site - which is contrary to what city thinks! That means the city doesn't even know stays here!!! There is a red van in the lot with no registration.

With all the above, and no abatement after three weeks, the residents are feeling more insecure. There are fewer kids playing in the kids park and in the basketball court. The site occupiers are acting irresponsibly, has a history of having caused fires, the site has many dead trees, and the residents are appalled at how ill equipped city is with tiny fire extinguishers!

This site, which you call "safe" parking site - is literally the opposite. You have put people who have proven themselves to be irresponsible in the midst of this community with your only hope being them sticking to a code of conduct. And they are proving themselves to be not able to that week after week.

I request you to put an end to this unsafe site as soon as you can.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Cheung

Sent from my iPhone

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect



exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.



**Fw: It's impact to our life - request city to put an end on Safe RV parking site**

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 9/30/2021 9:37 AM

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

## 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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:10 PM

To: Joe L <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov <Matt.mahan@sanjose.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

<[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey  
<Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>;  
Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt  
<Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: It's impact to our life - request city to put an end on Safe RV parking site

Hello Joe,

In an effort to address additional questions and observations at the temporary safe parking site, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,

Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell:

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**From:** Joe L <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:16 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** It's impact to our life - request city to put an end on Safe RV parking site

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

[External Email]

Hi city council,

Regarding the Safe RV parking site located @ 71 Vista Montana San Jose, we have been rising a big concern on the kid's safety, as it's only 2 feet away from a kid's park. we feel surprised and unbelievable that how can city place this site right next to kid's park??

We noticed that there is oil spilled on the ground without taken care of it, and couple of trash bags on the top of RV in the past days, which really affect the living environment quality of the local neighborhood.

Meanwhile, this site says there will be 24/7 security guard, but we found there is only one car parked at one of the entrances, but without a security guard in the car.

Weather is getting cold soon, how are those unhoused people to generate the heat? if using generator , it will worsen the air quality in this area.

Also, as City has found it before this site is arsenic contaminated , should not use for residential. But City is still putting those unhoused people in this site, which put their life in danger too!

So in short, we start not letting our kids to go to the park, and feel so insecure living in this area, because of this none well planned arrangement by the City.

This is 3-lose situation, bad for local neighborhood, bad for unhoused people and bad for city council that losing the trust from people who voted for you.

Therefore, we urge City to put an end on this site asap.

Thank you  
Joe

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

**Fw: 71 Vista Montana RV parking encampment**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:37 AM

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

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:03 PM

**To:** Sowmya Mruthyunjaya <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov  
<david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky  
<Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie  
<Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul  
<Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena  
<Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya  
<Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam  
<Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
<[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy  
<[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4  
<District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk  
<city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking  
<Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: 71 Vista Montana RV parking encampment

Hello Sowmya,

In an effort to communicate updated information to residents, City staff have updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document that incorporates answers to additional questions that we have received; please see attached. Neighbors may also contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,

Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)



---

**From:** Sowmya Mruthyunjaya <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:28 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** 71 Vista Montana RV parking encampment

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

[External Email]

Hello all,  
Making repeated requests to you to reconsider your decision of moving the RV encampment to 71 Vista montana. It's not safe to have it next to a kids park and right across a soccer field where teens practice.  
It would be better to move them to a place where there are wrap-around services and these folks can be rehabilitated. There are no showers for those people to maintain good hygiene. As i noticed not many people are living there and it's a costly affair to keep them in the parking lot of an out of commission building. Hope you take community input next when you develop affordable housing.

--  
Sowmya

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



## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

**How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

**Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

**How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

**Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

**Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

## Fw: Citizen's voice against 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking and lack of communication from city

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 9/30/2021 9:37 AM

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

### 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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 9:52 PM

**To:** giyoung21c <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Citizen's voice against 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking and lack of communication from city

Hello Giyoung,

Attached is an updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document that addresses points you raise in your email, as well as answers to questions we have received from many residents. Neighbors may contact the Housing Department at 408-793-6827 or [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) with questions or comments about safe parking.

Best regards,

Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**From:** giyoon21c <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 2:47 PM  
**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Citizen's voice against 71 Vista Montana Safe RV parking and lack of communication from city

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

[External Email]

Re: Sharing concerns of a citizen who's daily life is impacted by the safe RV site that's been setup in 71 Vista Montana with Emphasis on personal side and direct impact on neighborhoods.

Over the weekend, I met my immediate neighbor on a different row - a nice couple who resides in Renaissance and I was heart broken to hear that they are putting their condo out for a market. Husband (works in IT) was busy doing remodeling and cleaning up the garage over the weekend.

From the brief conversation, they said that the RV park by the city was the tipping point over to put the house on the market.

Safe Parking or not (no matter how you want to paint it), we didn't agree to it and you put it there just because it's a city owned land. I'd like to remind you that there is an adjacent children's park right next to it.

There are numerous violations at the site's protocol that we were assured of prior and logical reasons why this site should have never been THE place. So far, the all our requests seem to be met with "tire 'em out, they will go away".

I drive this area by every day for daily commute wondering and worrying about what new event will unfold. Do you think it's the right thing to do? Many parents have stopped taking their children to the park.

Yes, homeless is a big problem now as I am just finding out because of this incident. However, the decision to put it so close the the children's park and densely populated residential neighborhood needs re-examination and immediate injunction.

Please re-consider this RV safe site so closed to children's park and residential neighborhood and put some robust community involved decision making process when it comes to the unhoused.

Thank you.

Giyoun Yoon

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City



monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security



- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

**Fw: RV Parking site 71, Vista Montana : Deteriorating conditions. Need answers or plan from the city.**

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 9/30/2021 9:37 AM

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

**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:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 9:45 PM

**To:** Sugandha P <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: RV Parking site 71, Vista Montana : Deteriorating conditions. Need answers or plan from the city.

Hello Sugandha – attached is an updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document that incorporates answers to additional questions that we have received.

Best regards,  
Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

---

**From:** Sugandha P <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 4:50 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Safe Parking <Safe.Parking@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** RV Parking site 71, Vista Montana : Deteriorating conditions. Need answers or plan from the city.

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

[External Email]

For the attention of the City Council, San Jose.

We still do not have answers or a clear plan of action from the City to address our concerns. These are the concerns of the hard working, tax paying, law-abiding residents of communities around 71, Vista Montana.

Not only do we not have answers, but conditions at 71 Vista Montana and outside of it are deteriorating as well with people from the safe parking site running red lights without caution, spilling oil and paint in and outside of the fence and no visible security personnel as promised.

Children are no longer going to the park adjacent to this site for obvious reasons.

It is not at all like how a spokesperson of Councilmember Cohen would like to believe, who said, *"(The neighbors) are starting to realize there's nothing happening out here. They're starting to lose the wind in their sails, for lack of a better term."* This sounds to me as if you really do not care for the tax paying residents of the communities here in North San Jose and I am sorry to hear such statements from a spokesperson of the Councilmember who is supposed to represent us.

This is not just about the residents outside of 71 Vista Montana. It is also about the people who are temporarily housed in 71 Vista Montana. They do not have access to services like running water, bathrooms, qualified caseworkers, health clinics etc. It certainly does not seem like a workable solution for them either.

The result is therefore a situation that the city thinks is a solution, but saddled with astronomical costs that does not work for the relocated homeless, and does not work for the existing tax paying hard working residents of this neighborhood community.

We still have no answers on a request for an audit of the decision making process. We also have requested documentation that clearly outlines in great detail why other sites were discarded. We also requested that this process of hasty decision-making in secrecy not be repeated and for the city to be transparent about what steps are being taken about re-housing these dwellers to a permanent location away from 71 Vista Montana. Where are you with this process?

Regards,  
Sugandha.

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect



exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.

**Fw: Where is the oversight?!**

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

Thu 9/30/2021 9:38 AM

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

---

**From:** Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 9:41 PM

**To:** Sheena Madan <[REDACTED]> david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov <david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Where is the oversight?!

Hello Sheena – I am providing an updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document (see attached) that incorporates answers to additional questions that we have received. Also, a meeting is being scheduled with neighborhood leaders and City staff.

Best regards,  
Rosalynn

**Rosalynn Hughey**

Deputy City Manager | Office of the City Manager

Cell: [REDACTED]

[rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov)

City of San José | 200 E. Santa Clara St. | San José, CA 95113

[www.sanjoseca.gov](http://www.sanjoseca.gov) | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

---

**From:** Sheena Madan <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 4:55 PM

**To:** david.sykes@sanjoseca.gov; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Ho, Wendy <[REDACTED]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; District4

<District4@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** Where is the oversight?!

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

[External Email]

Dear San Jose and Santa Clara County Officials,

As I described in a previous email, the 71 Vista Montana Safe RV Parking Site fails the homeless participants, the neighbors, and the city.

However, I have a different question this time. I would like to learn what kind of recourse we have when a program like this is clearly failing. How can we alert the appropriate people and request an independent evaluation when the main channels of communication are failing us?

However, we don't seem to have a path to get this addressed. My neighbors and I have missed work and had to arrange childcare to attend:

- Two City Hall meetings
  - Cut off after 1 minute in Open Forum after waiting hours to speak
  - People "raised hand" in Zoom and did not get a chance to speak
- Housing Commission meeting
  - Told "This site has already been approved" and there is nothing to be done
- Planning Commission
  - Cut off after 1 minute in Open Forum after waiting hours to speak
  - Told this is outside the scope
- Rules and Open Government
  - Vice Mayor Jones was very patient, but clearly no follow up actions
- Community meeting with Cohen
  - Held in the last business hour before the site was supposed to open, leaving no time for addressing issue
  - Evasive answers from Councilmember Cohen
- Follow-up small meeting with Cohen
  - Councilmember Cohen did not seem to know much about who was at the site or how it was being run; no re-evaluation criteria and no explicit timeline

Obviously, you have also heard from us through e-mails and other communication. Those letters take time and effort to compose and mostly get silence or a form letter response.

Our e-mails to the only dedicated address, [safe.parking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safe.parking@sanjoseca.gov):

1. Get a patronizing response a few \_days\_ later

2. Claim the site participants are model citizens on their best behavior, unless we can present hard evidence otherwise

3. Photos and videos and eye-witness accounts showing violations of code of conduct are dismissed

Councilmember Cohen has asked us to be his "eyes and ears". Most of us don't feel safe walking by the site late in the evening anymore -- my kids haven't gone to this park since the site was announced even though we used to visit multiple times a week.

We cannot be expected to patrol it 24/7! Plus apparently we're not credible witnesses anyway. Despite that, we have hard evidence that goes ignored.

I hope I am able to communicate our frustration! How do we even get government oversight to evaluate this site against reasonable, objective criteria for success?

Why isn't the Planning Commission livid that this type of clear zoning change wasn't run by them. Even if Emergency Operations Center protocols were initially invoked, why isn't the City Council currently involved in re-evaluating this when the initial emergency is averted?

We're pouring a lot of energy trying to find the right channels to communicate and engage with you productively to find win-win solutions and getting almost no response.

Please help us figure out the right way to challenge this because this site at this location makes absolutely no sense and needs to be shut down before it permanently changes our neighborhood.

Sheena Madan

p.s. Here is the response from the Safe Parking address. I also want to note that at least several of these vehicles don't even have license plates (so it's ridiculous to expect us to record them), but we've seen them come out of or drive into the site.

"Thank you for contacting us regarding the Safe Parking site at 71 Vista Montaña. Everyone parking a vehicle at the site has agreed to a code of conduct, which includes abiding by all City ordinances and regulations. If you witness any criminal or dangerous activity in progress, please call 9-1-1. For any other incidents of concern, please gather as much information as possible, such as license plate numbers or photos. We will look into your concerns.

However, please keep in mind that people staying at 71 Vista Montaña have a strong incentive to comply with our code of conduct. They can be removed from the site if they break the rules. We respectfully ask people who live in the area to avoid jumping to conclusions regarding their new neighbors. Based on our experience with other Safe Parking sites, most of the participants have a sincere desire to do the right thing as they work to rebuild their lives."

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

## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

**How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

**Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

**How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

**Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

**Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.



## **71 Vista Montaña | Temporary Safe Parking Site**

### **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

### **Updated September 29, 2021**

#### **What has the City been doing about encampments?**

The unsheltered crisis has grown in recent years necessitating a variety of responses outlined in the current Community Plan to End Homelessness. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the crisis, requiring additional responses to encampments and the adjacent neighborhoods. The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) initiated efforts to support encampment residents and contain impacts through hygiene, sanitation, and other basic services. The EOC also developed protocols around assessment and intervention when conditions and impacts in and around encampments become significant and/or unacceptable.

#### **What is a safe parking site?**

Due to the high cost of housing in our area, many people in San José cannot afford to rent apartments. Many of these individuals live in their vehicles. Safe parking sites allow people who live in vehicles to park legally in a secure lot, without being subjected to potential citation and towing if parked on City streets. These locations have portable toilets and hygiene stations, and participants typically have access to case management and supportive services to help them make progress toward stable housing.

#### **Why was this temporary safe parking site established now?**

A large encampment, which included many RVs, grew over time on private property in North San José. Very recently, the property owner decided to remove the encampment and relocate the unsheltered people to emergency shelters and other temporary locations. While most people (approximately 50) were successfully transitioned into temporary housing, a small number of people living in RVs or other vehicles needed a place to park. Given that a number of individuals decided to forgo the shelter/motel option, and intended to stay in their RV or vehicle, the City had to make a quick decision – watch RVs scatter around North San José or find a temporary location where people can park legally and receive basic services. We chose the latter option, which we believe is in the best interest of all of San José.

#### **Why did the City place the site at 71 Vista Montaña?**

City staff diligently searched for numerous public and private sites throughout the City where temporary or long-term safe-parking facilities could be placed. Staff identified potential sites, but for various reasons, including control of the land and cost, all but one was infeasible within the timeframe of transition. The one feasible location was the City-owned site at 71 Vista Montaña, a vacant office building slated for demolition and future development as affordable housing.

#### **Why wasn't there more communication with neighbors before the site was activated?**

The City typically engages with neighbors prior to activating these types of facilities. However, this was an extraordinary situation. The City had very little time to identify and develop the operations for this site. In fact, the decision to use the Vista Montaña site was finalized only a few days before the site opened to have a place for people being displaced. Despite the compressed timeline, City staff is sensitive to the concerns of neighbors. Staff will continue to communicate with neighbors to ensure their input is considered as the City

monitors the operation of the site. Staff will remain engaged with neighbors as site usage evolves into permanent affordable housing.

#### **How long will the Temporary Safe Parking site on Vista Montaña be used?**

It may be used for up to nine months as a temporary safe-parking site. If the City can secure and start operations at another safe parking site prior to that timeframe, the participants could be transitioned, and the site could be closed earlier, as was always a consideration in the opening of the temporary site.

#### **Is the City actively looking for longer term, more permanent site(s) to allow overnight parking for people living in their RV or passenger vehicle, particularly people temporarily staying the 71 Vista Montaña site?**

Yes. The City is actively pursuing other sites and is doing so in partnership with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Housing Authority, and County. The goal is to secure at least one to two sites for up to two years, and ideally longer. Once an adequate site is secured, it is anticipated those residing at 71 Vista Montaña would be offered an opportunity relocate to the new site. Once the relocations have occurred, the 71 Vista Montaña site would be closed to temporary safe parking. The expectation is that Vista Montaña will not operate more than nine months, and if another site can be secured earlier (possibly by the end of 2021 or early in 2022), the temporary site at Vista Montaña could close earlier.

#### **How many vehicles can park at the site on Vista Montaña?**

The site can accommodate up to 20 people and their RV and passenger vehicles. Initially, nine people were invited to stay at the site. Less than the nine people accepted the invitation. Since the site opened, one additional person from another encampment was invited to park at the site. Based on how things go with the current participants at the site, additional participants and vehicles could be offered the opportunity to temporarily park at the site, but no decision or additional offers have been made yet.

#### **Can anyone park there?**

No. Participation is by invitation only. Nine people who had been living on the Component Drive property were screened and invited to the Vista Montaña site. One additional individual was allowed entry to the site after they were screened, and the individual has been a responsible participant on-site. No further invitations have been extended thus far, and that will remain the approach until staff does further evaluation of the site over the coming weeks to determine stability and criticality of need.

#### **Is the site secure?**

Yes. The City has provided 24/7 on-site security. The site is fenced, portable lighting has been installed, and all participants are expected to abide by a code of conduct, includes the following:

- Abide by all City ordinances and regulations
- Keep vehicles within designated space boundaries and keep possessions and materials/disposables within your RV and/or vehicles, or immediately adjacent
- Observe quiet hours from 10 pm to 7 am, and control noise remainder of day
- No fires of any kind, including barbeques
- Bag and contain trash for disposal in City of San Jose on-site dumpsters
- Use proper human waste disposal receptacles (e.g., on-site port-a- potties, mobile waste dumping systems, or designated waste dumping locations)
- No trespassing into the on-site vacant commercial building
- Shelter within vehicles (no tents, lean-tos, or other temporary facilities on the property)
- No video or other amplified sound may be played or generated that is audible outside of vehicles
- No visitors on-site
- Follow requests from security

- Only registered vehicles with the safe parking program are allowed on-site
- Be respectful of public property and neighbors
- Head of household accepts responsibility for all members of household

#### **Why does this temporary safe parking site only have basic minimum levels of service?**

The site was urgently stood up to address the short timeframe associated with the clearing of a nearby site and associated encampment. The City did not have available safe parking alternatives and wanted to avoid randomly scattering more people, RVs, and vehicles across North San José. Given available timing, resources, and the temporary nature of this site, spending limited funds on longer-term facilities such as piped running water, permanent bathrooms, and lighting, etc. was not practical, and securing higher levels of services—beyond port-a-potties, trash removal, sewage disposal, and security—was not possible in the short term. However, higher levels of service will be part of the focus for a longer-term site being pursued at this time, with the goal of transitioning those at 71 Vista Montaña to the new site.

#### **Is the private property owner, where RV/vehicle residents were relocated from, providing outreach and case management at Vista Montaña, or is that service being provided at some level by the City?**

No, the private property owner is not providing outreach and case management services to individuals staying at the Vista Montaña site. The private property owner is providing outreach and case management services to individuals they relocated to shelter and motel sites through the non-profit service provider HomeFirst. The City of San José has had to assume responsibility for outreach and case management follow-up for those individuals at Vista Montaña, also done through HomeFirst. Given the City's limited resources for outreach, the level of service is likely to be at a somewhat lower level of service/frequency than what is likely being provided at the shelter and motel site.

#### **Why does the gate and security vehicle on the Renaissance Drive side of the site appear to not have full-time security?**

The site initially opened with two security officers present 24/7, with the anticipation that as the site transitioned to more stable operations, one 24/7 security officer would be sufficient to maintain a secure site. The City's Housing Department continues to conduct daily site visits and regularly communicates with security to ensure that the operation and site remain safe.

#### **Is car maintenance allowed on-site? Neighbors witnessed one person changing oil in their vehicle.**

Generally, car maintenance is discouraged. Exceptions would likely be allowed to repair a vehicle that may not be running at the current time, and ultimately would need to be moved off-site. Preventive maintenance, such as changing oil is discouraged. The City acknowledges that an oil change did occur, and the prohibition on that type of activity is being reinforced with security and the participants.

#### **What happens if a participant violates the rules?**

Violations of the code of conduct may result in a participant being asked to leave the site, depending upon the severity of the violation and the cooperation and willingness of the participant to stop the conduct that is not consistent with the spirit of the code of conduct.

#### **Based upon the City's purchase documents, the site has arsenic in the underlying soil. Is it safe to operate a temporary /short-term overnight parking site at the location?**

Staff from the City's Environmental Services Department have determined that the paved asphalt/concrete parking lot and on-site building create a protective barrier from the soil, making the temporary/short-term use of the site for overnight parking in vehicles safe, based upon industry and regulatory standards. The building and paved parking lot must remain in-tact and undisturbed during the temporary on-site parking operation, and no camping outside of vehicles on isolated landscaped areas is allowed, to avoid direct or indirect

exposure to soil. Any future project that may result in the disturbance of soil will require mitigation by the City/developer through the removal of soil and/or creating a new cap over the soil, consistent with regulatory requirements.

**What are the plans/timeline for a permanent affordable housing project at the site and how will the City communicate with the community?**

Through an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement executed in 2020, the City is partnering with Charities Housing Development Corporation of Santa Clara County (Charities Housing) to propose development of an affordable housing project at the Vista Montana site. The project proposal includes amenities such as a library and childcare center. While plans are currently at preliminary stage, the developer is planning to host virtual community meetings. Staff has already established an email distribution list comprised of neighborhood residents and stakeholders who have contacted the Housing Department, City Manager's Office, and the City Council about the temporary safe parking site. Information on the future affordable housing development will be sent to this list.

**How can neighbors ask questions and voice concerns?**

Neighbors may contact the San José Housing Department at [safeparking@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:safeparking@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-793-6827 with questions or comments about safe parking. If there is an emergency at the site, please call 9-1-1.