



# Memorandum

**TO:** Honorable Mayor &  
City Council

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

**SUBJECT:** The Public Record  
March 19, 2026 – March 26, 2026

**DATE:** April 1, 2026

---

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

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

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

1. Letter from Donna Torres Diaz, dated March 22, 2026, regarding: City council meeting March 17, 2026 Agenda item 3.3.
2. Letter from Minh Le, dated March 23, 2026, regarding: Welcoming City 4-Star Recognition—and a Way to Move Toward 5 Stars.
3. Letter from Anthony Gairnese and Laura Ohara, received March 23, 2026, regarding: Opposition to the proposed Business Improvement District (BID) for the Alameda District in San Jose, California.
4. Letter from Sarah Curtis, dated March 25, 2026, regarding: Invitation: Press Conference Today on SJUSD School Closures.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Toni J. Taber".

---

Toni J. Taber, MMC  
City Clerk



Outlook

---

**Fw: City council meeting March 17, 2026 Agenda item 3.3**

---

**From** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Date** Mon 3/23/2026 3:45 PM**To** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

---

**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2026 7:58 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: City council meeting March 17, 2026 Agenda item 3.3**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? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Donna Torres Diaz [REDACTED]**Sent:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 8:01 AM**To:** Kamei, Rosemary <Rosemary.Kamei@sanjoseca.gov>; Campos, Pamela <Pamela.Campos@sanjoseca.gov>; Tordillos, Anthony <Anthony.Tordillos@sanjoseca.gov>; David.cohen@sanjoseca.-gov <David.cohen@sanjoseca.-gov>; Ortiz, Peter <Peter.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov>; Doan, Bien <Bien.Doan@sanjoseca.gov>; Candelas, Domingo <Domingo.Candelas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Casey, George <George.Casey@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Maguire, Jennifer <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]**Subject:** City council meeting March 17, 2026 Agenda item 3.3

[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](#)

Good morning,

Please accept my apology for the delay in submitting my input regarding the important matter concerning 1 Branham Lane; I was unexpectedly out of the country attending to a family emergency

and regrettably missed the deadline. However, I believe it is imperative to formally share my perspective and recommendation on this vital community issue.

As a resident of the Deer Run II community for over 24 years, located directly adjacent to 1 Branham Lane, I possess a deep and personal understanding of our neighborhood's dynamics and the profound impact this site has on our daily lives. Over this period, we have observed changes that have regrettably diminished the overall quality of life within our community. We are earnestly seeking a sustainable solution that restores safety, peace, stability, and a sense of security to our environment.

My strong recommendation, therefore, is to transform the existing facility at 1 Branham Lane into permanent, low-income housing. This approach offers a comprehensive and beneficial resolution for all stakeholders involved. Unlike the transient nature of a shelter, permanent housing fosters a sense of stability and belonging, allowing residents to integrate more fully into the community and take pride in their surroundings. This provides a genuine opportunity for individuals to establish roots, access consistent support and resources, and become contributing members of Deer Run II, ultimately enhancing, rather than detracting from, the neighborhood's fabric.

Such a transformation would not only address the critical need for affordable housing in a structured manner but also significantly improve the long-term well-being and security of both the new residents and our existing community members. I respectfully urge you to seriously consider this alternative as a path toward a more stable, harmonious, and equitable future for 1 Branham Lane and the entire Deer Run II community.

Sincerely,

Donna Torres Diaz

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

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



**Fw: Welcoming City 4-Star Recognition—and a Way to Move Toward 5 Stars**

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 3/23/2026 10:33 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? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

**From:** Minh Le [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2026 9:51 AM  
**To:** The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; Maguire, Jennifer <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@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>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Welcoming City 4-Star Recognition—and a Way to Move Toward 5 Stars

[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](#)

Dear Mayor Mahan, Councilmembers, and City Manager Maguire,  
I am resending my message below to ensure it reaches the appropriate recipients. It appears that my earlier email did not reach the City Manager’s office due to an incorrect address.  
For completeness and transparency, I am also copying the City Clerk.  
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,  
Minh Le

\*\*\*\*\*

Mayor Mahan, Councilmembers, and City Manager Maguire,  
I am writing to congratulate you and the City of San José on your recertification as a “4-Star Certified Welcoming Community.” This recognition is well deserved.  
For decades, San José has been shaped and strengthened by people from around the world. Its commitment to inclusion, belonging, and opportunity has made it not only a center of innovation but a place where diverse communities can take root and thrive.

Over the past three decades, as a leadership and organizational effectiveness consultant, I have had the privilege of working alongside City leaders and staff. I have consistently observed a culture grounded in principled leadership, collaboration, and a genuine commitment to serving all residents with fairness and respect.

That culture matters. It builds trust—and trust is what sustains a truly welcoming city.

The Vietnamese refugee community is part of that story. Over the past half century, refugees have rebuilt their lives here and contributed meaningfully to the cultural and civic fabric of San José. The Viet Museum stands as a testament to that journey.

I have appreciated the efforts made over the past 15 months—first by the Mayor’s Chief of Staff and then by your Deputy City Manager—to address the closure of the Viet Museum and to work toward preserving this important community asset.

At the same time, I would respectfully share an important perspective.

There is a general understanding within the community that History San Jose is under contract with the City to operate the Historic Park. However, its actions over the past 15 months regarding the Viet Museum have created the impression that it is exercising power and authority far beyond what is contemplated in that agreement.

This perception was reinforced early on, when History San Jose communicated that the closure decision came from the Mayor’s Office—an assertion later clarified and retracted. While that correction was important, the initial mischaracterization left a lasting impression and blurred the line between the City and its contractor.

When actions perceived as unjust—and a pattern of shifting and confusing signals—are not clearly addressed, there is a risk that the community experiences those actions as coming from the City leadership itself.

In moments like this, clarity and accountability matter. Distinguishing the City’s role from that of History San Jose—and holding each appropriately accountable—would go a long way toward restoring trust. Concerns within the community regarding interference in Viet Museum governance, denial of access to its legitimate stewards, and unilateral decisions affecting the future of the museum warrant clear, transparent, and good-faith engagement.

The absence of that engagement has been deeply felt.

In particular, a written threat by the CEO of History San Jose to cancel the existing Viet Museum agreement and issue an RFP to replace the current nonprofit operator is deeply concerning. Such an action would undermine established stewardship, disregard community trust, and raise serious questions about governance, fairness, and respect for the institution that built and sustained the museum over decades.

It raises legitimate questions about whether the agreement between the City and History San Jose permits actions that appear inconsistent with San José’s Welcoming City values. I do not believe that any of you would knowingly support such actions. If the current agreement allows for them, it should be revisited and revised to ensure alignment with the City’s stated values and commitments.

Because the strength of San José’s “Welcoming City” designation ultimately rests not only on certification, but on whether every community feels that their history is respected and their place in the city is secure.

San José has earned its reputation as a Welcoming City.

This is an opportunity to reaffirm it—and move toward a 5-Star standard.

I urge you to direct staff to:

- Rebuild trust with the Vietnamese refugee community through clarity and transparency regarding the Viet Museum.
- Hold History San Jose accountable for past practices that have not aligned with San José’s Welcoming City values.
- Reopen the Viet Museum and be welcoming again to the people and organization that have been entrusted for nearly half a century with this sacred responsibility.

I am grateful for your leadership and thank you for your continued commitment to a city where all communities can belong and thrive.

Respectfully,

Minh Le  
President, The Wilfred Jarvis Institute  
*(For lasting leadership and organizational effectiveness)*



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

March 15, 2026  
Office of the City Clerk  
City of San Jose  
200 E. Santa Clara St.  
Tower, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

RECEIVED  
SAN JOSE CITY CLERK  
2026 MAR 23 AM 10:45  
PC Mail

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to formally express our opposition to the proposed Business Improvement District (BID) for the Alameda District in San Jose, California. We recently received the notification of this BID as the letter was not addressed directly to us.

We are the landlords of a single residential property within the St. Leo's neighborhood. As the owners of only one residential property, we do not see how the formation of this BID — or the proposed annual charge of \$350 — would provide any meaningful benefit to our property or to small property owners like ourselves. The BID structure appears to be designed primarily for commercial property interests, and it is unclear how residential landlords with a single home would reasonably benefit from the services or programs proposed.

Additionally, there is already an existing improvement district operating within this area — the Alameda Community Benefit Improvement District. The proposed creation of another BID that overlaps with an existing district raises serious concerns about duplication of services, administrative inefficiency, and the potential for property owners to be subjected to multiple layers of assessments for similar or unclear purposes. The City should clearly explain why a new district is necessary when an existing district already operates within the same area and whether the proposed services are already being funded through the current structure.

From our perspective, this fee feels less like an improvement initiative and more like an additional tax placed on property owners who have little voice in how the funds will be spent. We are also concerned about the lack of clear community oversight and accountability regarding how the collected funds will be managed, allocated, and evaluated. Who will determine who serves on the BID governing committee, and what mechanisms will exist to ensure transparency and responsible use of these funds? We also foresee that this fee may increase over time, similar to how the San Jose Business Tax for rental property has increased since its inception.

Under California law governing property-based assessments, including the requirements established by Proposition 218, any assessment imposed on property owners must provide a clear and proportional "special benefit" to the assessed property that exceeds the general benefit received by the public at large. At present, it is not evident how a single residential property such as ours would receive a distinct, measurable, and proportional benefit from the activities

typically funded by a Business Improvement District, such as marketing, commercial corridor promotion, or business-oriented services.

Before imposing additional financial burdens on small property owners, the proposed BID and/or City Council should clearly demonstrate:

- How residential properties within the district will receive a **direct, measurable, and proportional special benefit.**
- How the assessment methodology complies with **Proposition 218** requirements regarding proportionality.
- Why a **new BID is necessary when the Alameda Community Benefit Improvement District already exists within the same area.**
- What governance structure will ensure **community oversight, transparency, and accountability** for the funds collected.
- Whether exemptions should be provided for **small residential property owners who receive little or no direct benefit.**

Without clear answers to these questions, it is difficult to justify the creation of this BID or the mandatory fees associated with it.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the City to reconsider the formation of this Business Improvement District or, at the very least, exempt small residential property owners who receive no direct or proportional benefit from the program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Anthony Gairnese and Laura Ohara

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

*[Handwritten mark]*



**Fw: Invitation: Press Conference Today on SJUSD School Closures**

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Wed 3/25/2026 8:24 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? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Sarah Curtis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 8:12 AM  
**To:** The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; district1@sanjose.gov <district1@sanjose.gov>; District9 <district9@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>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Cc:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Invitation: Press Conference Today on SJUSD School Closures

[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](#)

Hi Mayor Mahan and Councilmembers,

Following up with an important update: a group of families has now filed multiple formal Uniform Complaint Procedure (UCP) complaints against San José Unified School District regarding the proposed school closures and boundary changes.

For weeks, families have raised serious concerns about equity, discrimination, student safety, and lack of transparency, and despite widespread community opposition, the Board is still expected to vote tomorrow night.

We are holding a press conference today, Wednesday, March 25 at 1:00 PM at:

Canoas Elementary School  
880 Wren Dr  
San Jose, CA 95125

We would welcome your attendance, a representative from your office, or a public statement ahead of tomorrow's vote acknowledging the serious concerns families are raising.

These decisions affect not only students and school communities, but also broader issues that matter to the City of San José — including neighborhood stability, housing, traffic, equity, and public trust.

Given the City's stated commitments to equity and community stability, we hope city leadership will not remain silent while families are raising these concerns publicly and formally.

Thank you for your time and attention.

SJUSD Families United

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