
FW: March 3rd City Council Agenda Item 3.4

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 8:06 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Deborah St. Julien <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2026 11:25 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: District1 <district1@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>
Subject: March 3rd City Council Agenda Item 3.4

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Dear Council Member Campos, and all Council Members and Mayor Mahan,

My name is Deborah St. Julien living in District 2, a member of SURJ Santa Clara County and the Urban Sanctuary faith community.

When I read this policy last week, I found it demeaning and depressing. No real consideration for people with disabilities was evident. It felt like an exercise to check a box and silence the folks with disabilities and their advocates, disingenuous and without humanity.

I know the challenges are vast. We have thousands of unhoused people on our streets, many with disabilities.

I just want to remind the Mayor and all the Council Members, these are our brothers and sisters, our neighbors. The system is broken. Housing is unaffordable. [What about these sobering statistics from a recent Spotlight article:

"...[income inequality](#) and stratospheric [housing costs](#) make life a struggle for residents working outside of tech. **The top 10% of Silicon Valley households own 75% of the region's wealth, the report shows, while in Europe the top 10% control only 25%. The bottom half of households in Silicon Valley own just 1% of wealth. Roughly 28% of local households require outside assistance — from family members, charities or government programs — to survive.** "We see firsthand how widening income inequality undermines economic mobility and weakens the fabric of our community," Don Taylor, CEO of Catholic Charities of Santa Clara

County, told San José Spotlight. “Many families are working full time — often holding multiple jobs — yet still cannot achieve self-sufficiency because wages have not kept pace with the high cost of living. When minimum wage is not a living wage, assistance becomes a bridge to survival rather than a pathway to long-term stability.” Silicon Valley tech economy is hot, but not everyone benefits - San José Spotlight

We oppose this policy as written. Create a policy that insures agency and dignity for people. If the city takes people's property, people must be able to inspect it before signing for it—and the city must return it quickly instead of making people wait weeks for survival items. Also, if there are bulky items or several large bags, the city should return the property at a location convenient to the person picking them up. **We are asking you not to approve a system with no real accountability. The City Manager should not have sole discretion here. Unhoused people and advocates need actual oversight power. Unhoused people should be treated as experts in their field and consulted like any other experts would be.**

Deborah St Julien
D2 Resident
SURJ Santa Clara County
Urban Sanctuary faith community

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

FW: March 3rd City Council Agenda Item 3.4

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 8:06 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Sarah Hollingsworth [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2026 9:41 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: March 3rd City Council Agenda Item 3.4

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Dear Mayor and City Council,

My name is Sarah, and I am a member of SURJ Showing Up for Racial Justice Santa Clara. I am an active voter, teacher, and advocate for my unhoused neighbors. I **oppose** Agenda Item 3.4 as written.

I have spent time with many of my neighbors living in RVs and tents. I have witnessed the recent sweeps, listened to my neighbors lived experiences, and watched the way city officials have neglected and mistreated many of my neighbors. During the Columbus Park abatement, I watched the city tow vehicles directly to waste sites and destroyed everything inside. No documentation. No warning. No opportunity to remove belongings. That is a blatant series of civil rights violations. This happened repeatedly. I also saw numerous written outreach materials that were only in English. Abatement notices that exclude non-English speakers is discriminatory and negligent. If people cannot understand what they are signing, then you have not gained informed consent. The SOP references outreach coordination but does not require confirmation that anything actually occurred before abatement begins. Many of my neighbors shared that they did not receive any outreach from the city prior to abatement, often because they were at work during the short, unannounced visits and because accessible written notices were not provided. Furthermore, the city's offers of shelter, EIH, and other services are not always available or disability accessible. So how could someone access safe housing prior to their RV or tent being destroyed in front of them? Offering something inaccessible, that does not meet someone's needs is not offering anything but performative optics for the housed public. The city often creates inaccessible, unlivable offers for "safe housing" and then treats it as a refusal of services or grounds to declare property abandoned. That is shameful.

If the city takes people's property, people must be able to inspect it before signing for it—and the city must return it quickly instead of making people wait weeks for survival items. If there are bulky items or several large bags, the city should return the property at a location convenient to

the person picking them up. We, at SURJ, are asking you not to approve a system with no real accountability. The City Manager should not have sole discretion here. Unhoused people and advocates need actual oversight power. Unhoused people should be treated as experts in their field and consulted like any other experts would be.

Thank you,
Sarah Hollingsworth (she/ her)



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

FW: Item 3.4

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 8:18 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: iq4rent sc [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2026 9:46 PM
To: iq4rent sc [REDACTED]
Subject: Item 3.4

[External Email.] Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)

URG/GRACE Letter re Reasonable Accommodation and Property Impound Procedures, City of San José, February 2, 2026

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

On behalf of the Unhoused Response Group (URG) and Guadalupe Residents Advocating for Community Empowerment (GRACE), two all-volunteer grassroots organization providing direct aid and advocacy from and alongside unhoused residents across Santa Clara County, we write regarding Item 3.4 and the City's review of its Reasonable Accommodations (RA) and Personal Property Impound procedures.

First and foremost, with the sweep of The Jungle and Olinder camps looming, these items must be clarified and ratified prior to these sweeps. To pontificate, moralize and theorize on what should be done in "the next sweep" while the sweep of nearly 200 people is right before us would be ludicrous. These issues are under consideration because issues of great concern arose during the sweep of Columbus, let us not repeat the same mistakes.

We appreciate that the City has asserted its RA process is legally compliant. However, legal compliance is an exceedingly low bar. The question before Council should not be whether the City meets the minimum legal threshold, but whether the policy is clear, accessible, consistently implemented, and structured to protect the dignity and rights of people with disabilities and others facing significant barriers.

Based on our direct experience living in and supporting individuals in encampments, there are numerous examples of irregular conduct, inconsistent application of procedures, confusion about rights, finger pointing and significant hardship navigating the RA process. These documented experiences do not square with the City's conclusion that the process is functioning effectively in practice.

If the City's goal is accessibility and equity, then the policy must be written and implemented in a way that:

- Is transparent and understandable to those it is intended to protect
- Is consistently applied across departments and encampment sites • Includes clear documentation and accountability mechanisms
- Allows outside stakeholders to meaningfully evaluate whether it is working

Transparency

It is extremely difficult to provide constructive feedback when the underlying policies and procedures are not attached to the staff memo. Community members and advocates should not have to search for core documents in order to understand what Council is being asked to affirm.

In addition, the memo is unclear about what data will be tracked and reported. Without defined data collection standards, there is no meaningful way to evaluate whether the RA and impound processes are equitable or functioning as intended. We respectfully request that this item return to Council prior to the sweep of The Jungle and Olinder with a clear description of:

- What data will be maintained
- How it will be disaggregated
- How frequently it will be reported
- What benchmarks will be used to evaluate performance

Community Engagement

It is deeply concerning that unhoused residents and the advocates who work alongside them daily were not meaningfully consulted in the development or evaluation of these procedures. The people who best understand how these processes function on the ground are those directly impacted by them.

We ask that Council direct staff to convene interested stakeholders — including people with lived experience, disability advocates, and grassroots service providers — to identify implementation problems and determine whether amendments are needed. These people should later make up an independent advisory council that meets regularly and assists providers and council with the creation and implementation of policy as well as assisting when there are appeals to provider or council decisions.

Policy should not be shaped solely by internal review when there is a significant gap between written procedure and lived reality.

Personal Property Impound

We have also observed a substantial difference between how the Personal Property Impound Standard Operating Procedure appears on paper and how implementation unfolds in practice. To assess whether the process is operating fairly and equitably, the City should collect and publicly report the following data:

Volume and Disposition

- Per sweep: how many items were sorted into each category (personal property stored, bulk personal property stored, abandoned/disposed, hazardous, contraband)?

- What is the overall ratio of items stored to items disposed, reported per sweep, per quarter, and citywide?
- How many items were designated as "indispensable life necessities" (IDs, medications) and what happened to them specifically?
- How many items were determined to be "dirty" and what is the criteria for that?
- How many items were mobility aids—wheelchairs, canes, walkers, potty chairs, crutches, etc.?

Storage and Return

- How many stored items were claimed within the minimum storage period (30 days for standard, 14 days for bulk)?
- How many stored items were not claimed and were subsequently disposed of?
- How many items did someone initially make contact about but not pick up?
- How many cases have been filed against the city by people who have lost items during a sweep in 2025?
- How many cases were settled by the city of people who have lost items during a sweep in 2025? What was the average cost of these settlements?
- What was the average and median time from storage to successful property return?
- Of items claimed, how many were returned intact vs. documented as damaged, missing, or disposed of before the claim was made? (e.g. some items have been stolen from impound and this should be documented.)
- What is the policy regarding city employees taking any items from a sweep?

Documentation Compliance

- What percentage of sweeps had complete pre- and post-site photographic documentation as required by the SOP?
- How many items stored had complete labeling (date, location, owner name where known, tag number)?
- How many items were returned intact?
- Were two authorized staff members present for documentation, labeling, transportation, and disposal as required?

Equity in Disposal Decisions

- Are certain types of items being categorized as "abandoned" or "bulk" at disproportionate rates across sites, suggesting inconsistent application of presumptions?
- Are there patterns in where the 12x12 rule results in property presumed abandoned that correlate with site demographics?

These questions are not abstract. They go directly to whether personal property is being protected, whether procedures are being followed consistently, and whether certain communities are disproportionately losing their belongings.

Conclusion

Ultimately, the City's objective should not be to demonstrate legal defensibility. It should be to ensure high accessibility for people with disabilities, clarity for those navigating crisis, and humane treatment of individuals whose lives are already unstable.

Transparency, meaningful engagement, consistent implementation, and equity-focused data reporting are not optional enhancements. They are foundational to public trust.

We urge Council to strengthen this item by requiring clearer reporting standards, meaningful stakeholder engagement via the independent advisory council, and a commitment to evaluating not just whether the process is lawful, but whether it is working.

Respectfully,

Guadalupe Residents Advocating for Community Empowerment (GRACE)

Unhoused Response Group (URG)

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

FW: City Council Meeting 3/3/26 Item 3.4

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 8:18 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Bridget McKay <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2026 6:48 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: RE: City Council Meeting 3/3/26 Item 3.4

[External Email.] Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)

Dear Mayor Matt Mahan and City Council Members,

I am in support of the recommendations made by Jon Cicirelli Director of the San José Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services Dept and Zulma Maciel Director of San Jose Office of Racial and Social Equity.

I have seen first hand as a business owner the amount of personal items that can be left behind during scheduled abatements of homeless encampments.

I witnessed the abatements of Guadalupe River Park (adjacent to Autumn Parkway) and Union Pacific Railroad Company property located at 394 N Montgomery St bordered by Cinnabar and N Autumn Sts (off Juilan St near the SAP Center.)

My property is located in the near vicinity and the amount of debris, biowaste, garbage and vehicles required to be removed was staggering and took extensive coordination by all the Interagency Team Partners. I observed that personal belongings claimed by homeless individuals were carefully handled by BeautifySJ Team members as they cleared these sites.

BeautifySJ Team members provided sufficient information and dutiful outreach to the homeless individuals living in these encampments about the removal of personal property. I saw staff give ample time to homeless individuals to get their personal belongings gathered up. For example they provided additional time for the removal a vehicle because the person had a disability.

The staff's safety is crucial because they come in contact with biowaste, hazardous materials and questionable debris that should be handle with the upmost care.

Storage of some personal items might not even be possible because of cross contamination and the threat to public safety if stored.

Many personal belongings or items may not be allowed to be stored at supportive housing sites, shelters, hotels, or even rental properties. There is a real likelihood some items will never be reclaimed from storage.

Please give the staff the tools and clarity they need to do this work so that the directives to restore safe access to public parks and properties in our communities can continue.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Bridget McKay
Property Owner
Multifamily Housing Provider
Resident Council District 6

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

Fw: REAL Coalition Letter re Item 3.4 Reasonable Accommodation and Personal Property Impoundment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 9:56 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

 1 attachment (116 KB)

REAL Coalition CSJ RA + Property Procedures Analysis March 3, 2026.pdf;

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

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

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Shannon Zhang [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 9:44 AM

To: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; Tordillos, Anthony <Anthony.Tordillos@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>; Solivan, Erik <Erik.Solivan@sanjoseca.gov>; Cicirelli, Jon <Jon.Cicirelli@sanjoseca.gov>; Maciel, Zulma <zulma.maciel@sanjoseca.gov>; Maguire, Jennifer <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Kyra Kazantzis [REDACTED]; Kylie Clark [REDACTED]; Gianella Ordonez [REDACTED]; Brooke Tran [REDACTED]; Matt King [REDACTED]; Fruen, Joseph <Joseph.Fruen@sanjoseca.gov>; Lester, Elise <Elise.Lester@sanjoseca.gov>; Yamamoto, KiyomiH <Kiyomi.Yamamoto@sanjoseca.gov>; Ramirez, Lucas <lucas.ramirez@sanjoseca.gov>; Nguyen, Lam <Lam.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov>; Zarate, Sarah <Sarah.Zarate@sanjoseca.gov>; Arreola, Kiara <Kiara.Arreola@sanjoseca.gov>; Gvatua, Alexander <Alexander.Gvatua@sanjoseca.gov>; Moreno, Brisa <Brisa.Moreno@sanjoseca.gov>; aaron.zeelig@sanjose.gov <aaron.zeelig@sanjose.gov>; Danino, Shawn <Shawn.Danino@sanjoseca.gov>; Gomez, David <David.Gomez@sanjoseca.gov>; Fleming, Jonathan <Jonathan.Fleming@sanjoseca.gov>; Adera, Teddy <Teddy.Adera@sanjoseca.gov>; Yamamoto, KiyomiH <Kiyomi.Yamamoto@sanjoseca.gov>; Lee, Lynn <TheresaLynn.Lee@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughes, Scott <scott.hughes@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: REAL Coalition Letter re Item 3.4 Reasonable Accommodation and Personal Property Impoundment

[External Email]. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)

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

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor, Councilmembers, and Staff,

Please find attached a letter from the Race Equity Action Leadership Coalition (REAL) regarding Item 3.4 on the Reasonable Accommodations and Personal Property Impoundment processes. We look forward to your discussion on the topic.

Best,

Shannon Zhang | Nonprofit Policy + Advocacy Associate
Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits

[REDACTED] Web: svcن.org | [LinkedIn](#)

Pronouns: she/her/hers

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

March 3, 2026

Mayor & City Council, et. al
City of San José
200 East Santa Clara Street, 18th Floor
San José, CA 95113
Sent via electronic mail

REAL Coalition CSJ RA + Property Procedures Analysis Re: City Council Item 3.4

Dear Mayor Mayor Mahan, Vice-Mayor Foley and Members of the City Council:

This letter is submitted by the Housing Justice Workgroup of the Race Equity Action Leadership (REAL) Coalition. REAL is a nonprofit coalition advancing racial equity in public policy across Santa Clara County. In developing this analysis, we have engaged with frontline advocates working daily in encampments working with unhoused residents directly impacted by the City's policies.

Homelessness in San José is not experienced equally. African American residents, other communities of color, people with disabilities, and historically marginalized communities are significantly overrepresented among those living outdoors. Policies governing reasonable accommodations (RA) and property impoundment related to interventions with people living outdoors or in vehicles therefore carry profound racial and disability equity implications.

Reasonable Accommodation Procedures

The City has determined that its RA procedures are consistent with applicable laws. Legal compliance, however, is not an equity standard. When policies govern how people with disabilities navigate displacement, loss of shelter, and potential loss of personal property, the measure of success must include whether those policies reduce harm, remove barriers to access, and are experienced as fair and comprehensible by the people they are intended to protect.

As reported by URG and others, unhoused residents are experiencing confusion about how to request an accommodation, uncertainty about timelines and outcomes, and inconsistent application across sites. These experiences matter. When communities already overrepresented in homelessness encounter avoidable barriers within the accommodation process, the equity consequences are significant. Those lived realities warrant structured review and responsive adjustment.

At present, meaningful review is not possible. The memorandum does not include the governing RA procedures themselves. Council and the public are being asked to evaluate the sufficiency of a process without access to the underlying policy. That is a serious transparency gap. We recommend that this item return to Council or to an appropriate Council committee with the full RA procedures attached, so they can be properly examined, assessed against equity objectives, and informed by stakeholder input.

Engagement and Policy Development

The memorandum indicates that the current review of the RA and Personal Property Impound processes did not include structured engagement with individuals with lived experience, disability advocates, or nonprofit providers with operational insight into encampment response.

It is unclear why such engagement was not incorporated. The City has historically convened stakeholder discussions regarding homelessness and encampment policies and implementation challenges. While agreement is not guaranteed in those settings, the inclusion of lived and operational experience strengthens policy design and surfaces implementation gaps that may not be visible internally.

We respectfully recommend that Council direct staff to convene unhoused residents, disability advocates, and housing and service providers to examine how these procedures function in practice and to identify potential refinements.

Transparency and Accountability Through Data

Beyond clear documentation and meaningful engagement, effective governance requires measurable accountability.

The development of a data and outcome reporting system for the RA process presents an opportunity to move beyond activity tracking toward outcome-based evaluation. However, the memorandum does not clearly specify what data will be collected, how it will be disaggregated, or how it will be reported publicly.

Without defined data standards, Council and the public cannot determine whether:

- Access to the RA process is consistent,
- Outcomes vary across departments or sites,
-

- Certain demographic groups experience different results, or
- Implementation aligns with the City's stated equity commitments.

To support meaningful evaluation, we offer the following recommendations regarding data collection and reporting:

Volume and Access

- How many RA requests were received during each reporting period, broken down by abatement site and department (BeautifySJ, Housing, OLIVE)?
- How many RA requests made to SJPd were redirected to another program/department?
- How many requests were received verbally in the field vs. through formal written channels vs. submitted by a third-party advocate or service provider on someone's behalf?
- How many individuals were informed of their right to request an RA during the noticing period, and through what mechanism?

Types of Requests

- What was the nature of the accommodation requested? The City should track categories including but not limited to:
 - Extended time to gather belongings due to disability (mobility, cognitive, psychiatric)
 - Medication storage or safe transfer of prescribed medications
 - Translation or language access for communications, forms, or verbal instructions
 - Communication supports (ASL, plain language, alternative formats)
 - Assistance with physical tasks (packing, lifting) due to physical disability
 - Requests to delay abatement pending connection to accessible shelter or housing
 - Requests related to service or support animals
 - Requests related to durable medical equipment (wheelchairs, walkers, oxygen)
 - Requests that were informal or verbal and granted in the field without documentation
 - Who logged the accommodation request (city staff, service provider, advocate)? If City staff, which team?
 -

- If the City receives a kind of regular request not specified on this list, these asks should be tracked in its own category
- Requests related to culturally-specific needs.

Outcomes

- Of all RA requests received, how many were: (a) granted as requested; (b) granted with modification (i.e., a different accommodation was offered — and what was it?); (c) denied; (d) discontinued because the individual could not be reached or withdrew the request?
- For requests that were denied: what was the stated reason, and was a written explanation provided to the individual?
- For requests that resulted in a modified accommodation: was the individual notified of why the modification was made, and did they accept it?

Timeliness

- What was the average and median time from RA request submission to decision, by request type and outcome?
- How many requests exceeded a defined response benchmark (the City should set a minimum turnaround time on responses to a RA request of 72 hours and hold abatement until a response is provided, unless an emergency exists).
- How many abatements proceeded while an RA request was still pending?

Who Requested RAs and Who Was Affected

- Who submitted the request: the individual themselves, a community advocate, a service provider, or City staff on the individual's behalf?
- What are the demographic characteristics — race, ethnicity, gender identity, age, disability type where provided — of individuals who submitted RA requests, and how do those characteristics correlate with outcomes (granted vs. denied vs. modified)? (The notice of rights should explain why the city needs to track this data and make clear that providing this data is voluntary.)
- Among individuals who were subject to abatement but did not submit an RA: what is the demographic breakdown, and is there evidence that certain populations are less likely to access the process?

System-Level and Equity Reporting

-

- Are RA grant rates consistent across departments (BeautifySJ vs. Housing vs. OLIVE) and across abatement sites, or do they vary significantly? Significant variation suggests inconsistent application.
- Do individuals who submitted RAs through an advocate or service provider have different outcomes than those who submitted on their own? If so, this suggests the process is more accessible to people with support systems.
- What percentage of abatements included the Disability Affairs Officer in post-abatement debriefs, as the memo commits to?
- How many staff and contractors received required biannual SOP training, and what percentage of abatements were conducted by trained staff?

Governance and Council Oversight

Any substantive modifications to the RA or Personal Property Impound procedures should return to Council for discussion and any changes to those procedures should be documented in the appropriate Committee reports.

Conclusion

Policies governing reasonable accommodations and property impoundment in encampment contexts should reflect best practices in equity-centered governance — not simply legal minimums. Clear documentation, structured community engagement, transparent reporting, and outcome-based accountability are not ancillary considerations; they are foundational components of sound public policy.

We urge Council to ensure that these procedures are:

- Clearly documented and publicly accessible
- Informed by structured engagement with affected stakeholders
- Evaluated using disaggregated, outcome-focused data
- Subject to transparent Council oversight

These steps will strengthen the integrity, consistency, and equity of the City's approach.

Lastly, REAL Coalition supports the letters submitted by URG and the Law Foundation of Silicon Valley.

Sincerely,

Housing Justice Workgroup, REAL Coalition

About the REAL Coalition

The REAL community of Silicon Valley based nonprofit leaders and allies has been meeting since June 2020 to use our positional power to advocate for a more racially-just and equitable society; to establish a peer network of leaders committed to fighting white supremacy and systemic racism in ourselves and our institutions; and to hold each other accountable to the promises we made in the Nonprofit Racial Equity Pledge. The REAL coalition is broadly representative of the nonprofit community including human and community services, behavioral health and health, arts and culture, domestic violence, older adults, food security, education, environmental, farming, legal, disability rights, LGTBQ rights, ethnic, immigrant rights, housing and homelessness, criminal justice reform, urban planning, and intermediary organizations, and others. REAL has 50 core organizational members and over 125 organizations have participated in REAL.

Fw: March 3rd City Council Agenda Item 3.4

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 10:31 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

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

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Alison George [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 10:29 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: March 3rd City Council Agenda Item 3.4

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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

My name is Alison George from District 10 and I am a member of SURJ Santa Clara County.

I am writing to express my concern with issues related to the treatment of unhoused individuals in San Jose. As a long time resident of San Jose, I am deeply disturbed by the lack of affordable housing and limited options for lower income community members. The need to address homelessness is critical. However, any actions to relocate individuals should be done in a considerate and humane manner. As a community we need to support equity and racial justice for all of our community members. It is disturbing to see how our homeless community is being treated during relocation.

We oppose policy 3.4 as written for reasonable accommodation process and personal property impound handling . If the city takes people's property, people must be able to inspect it before signing for it—and the city must return it quickly instead of making people wait weeks for survival items. Also, if there are bulky items or several large bags, the city should return the property at a location convenient to the person picking them up.

We are asking you not to approve a system with no real accountability. The City Manager should not

have sole discretion here. Unhoused people and advocates need actual oversight power. Unhoused people should be treated as experts in their field and consulted like any other experts would be.

Regards,

Alison George

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