



Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council

FROM: Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
April 2, 2026 – April 9, 2026

DATE: April 15, 2026

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Letters from Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Letters from the Public

1. Letter from Pacific Gas and Electric Company, received April 6, 2026, regarding: NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RATE INCREASE REQUEST FOR ITS ENERGY EFFICIENCY 2028 BUSINESS AND PORTFOLIO PLAN APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC) A.26-03-017.
2. Letter from Brian Darby, dated April 8, 2026, regarding: For Open Forum Open Government meeting.

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

Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk

DATE: April 1, 2026

TO: STATE, CITY AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RATE INCREASE REQUEST FOR ITS ENERGY EFFICIENCY 2028 BUSINESS AND PORTFOLIO PLAN APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC) A.26-03-017

What is being requested?

PG&E is requesting a revenue increase of approximately \$200 million for a total of \$1.46 billion in revenue for energy efficiency programs for the 2028–2031 period. That is in comparison to the current authorized amount of \$1.26 billion for the current 2024–2027 period. The request would continue funding energy efficiency (EE) programs that are designed to lower overall energy costs, reduce energy bills for participating customers and improve the of high-efficiency products. The programs would also provide financial incentives to help with upfront costs of energy-saving programs along with education and training for customers and their contractors. Of the \$1.46B revenue requested, PG&E's EE Portfolio budget is \$909.7 million, which is \$15.5 million lower than the current cycle's authorized amount. The remaining \$551.6M is attributed to Regional Energy Networks and Community Choice Aggregator EE Portfolios and other fiscal agent activities directed by the CPUC which is \$214.3 million higher than the current cycle's authorized amount for these activities outside of PG&E's EE programs.

Estimated increase in electric and gas rates

If approved, residential electric and gas rates for Energy Efficiency programs will increase overall from 2028 through 2031 compared to current rates. This increase will be phased in over the program years. Actual changes in rates may vary by year. Detailed rate information will be sent directly to customers in a bill insert in April 2026.

How would this impact the typical residential customer?

If the request is approved, a typical residential electric customer using 500 kWh per month would see a bill increase of approximately \$0.31 per month. A typical residential gas customer using 31 therms would see a bill increase of approximately \$0.13 per month. Actual impacts will vary depending on usage and are subject to CPUC regulatory approval.

Additional information

You can read more about PG&E's request and make public comment by visiting apps.cpuc.ca.gov/c/A2603017. For questions about participating in CPUC matters, you can contact the Public Advisor's Office at Public.Advisor@cpuc.ca.gov, **1-866-849-8390**, or 505 Van Ness Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102. Please reference A.26-03-017 in any communication with the CPUC.

Questions about the request

If you have questions about PG&E's request, please contact PG&E at **1-800-743-5000**. For TTY call **711**. Para obtener más información sobre cómo este cambio podría afectar su pago mensual, llame al **1-800-660-6789** • 詳情請致電 **1-800-893-9555**.

If you would like an electronic copy of the filing and exhibits, please write to the address below:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Energy Efficiency 2028 Business and Portfolio Plan Application (A.26-03-017)
P.O. Box 1018
Oakland, CA 94604-1018

Message paid for by customers.

RECEIVED
SAN JOSE CITY CLERK
2026 APR 06 AM 10:33
PL Marj



Fw: For Open Forum Open Government meeting

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

Date Wed 4/8/2026 12:56 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 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

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

From: brian darby [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 12:54 PM

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

Subject: For Open Forum Open Government meeting

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

April 8 2026 [REDACTED]

Dear City Council

This is a list of some of my observations concerning how San Jose is handling the situation with people who are unhoused. I hope some of the suggestions help.

Lowering the Cost of Interim Housing in San José While Preserving Dignity, Safety, and Results

San José's high interim-housing costs are not, by themselves, proof of corruption or incompetence. The city is often paying for a more complete product than the phrase "tiny home" suggests: private units, site work, utility hookups, hygiene facilities, staffing, case management, and operating support. Recent public information from the city and local partners shows that San José has built a sizable interim system, not just a few isolated villages, and that the real policy question is now how to improve cost-effectiveness and outcomes rather than whether the city has done anything at all. ([City of San José](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

<https://www.homefirstscc.org/news-story/san-jose-s-first-tiny-home-village-on-private-land-already-half-full>

<https://knowledge.uli.org/-/media/files/case-studies/2024/lifemoves-branham-lane.pdf>

What San José has already done

San José has already built out a broad interim-housing system rather than relying only on traditional congregate shelter. On its public “Progress and Outcomes” page, the city says that from July 1, 2024 through December 31, 2025 it added 13 new interim shelter sites, expanded one existing site, and added 1,209 units. That is important because it shows the city is already pursuing a fast-capacity strategy at substantial scale. ([City of San José](#))

Source URL:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

San José has also already implemented more than one shelter model. Its current portfolio includes interim housing communities and multiple forms of temporary shelter rather than a single one-size-fits-all product. That matters because the city is already moving, at least in practice, toward a tiered system even if it has not fully described it that way in policy language. ([City of San José](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

San José has already used partner-controlled or unusually low-cost land in some cases. HomeFirst reported that Via del Oro cost \$17.2 million to build and \$2.7 million annually to operate, and that the site sits on privately owned land made available to support the program. That does not make the project cheap in an all-in sense, but it does show the city is already trying to reduce costs where it can through land arrangements and partnerships. ([HomeFirst](#))

Source URL:

<https://www.homefirstscc.org/news-story/san-jose-s-first-tiny-home-village-on-private-land-already-half-full>

San José has also already invested in much higher-spec interim housing. The ULI case study on Branham Lane describes it as noncongregate interim supportive housing with 204 units and a total project cost of \$59.8 million. That is a very different product from a low-cost cabin village, which is why comparing San José to volunteer-built or lightly installed shelter models in other cities can be misleading if the city is being judged as though it bought the same thing.

Source URL:

<https://knowledge.uli.org/-/media/files/case-studies/2024/lifemoves-branham-lane.pdf>

San José has already created a public reporting structure for homelessness-response outcomes. The city maintains public pages for interim housing communities and performance indicators, which means the city is not operating entirely in the dark. The more useful criticism is not that San José measures nothing, but that the public reporting could do more to compare cost, occupancy, exits, and length of stay across site types in a way that helps the Council decide what is working best. ([City of San José](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/data-key-performance-indicators>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

How San José's current approach appears to be working

The strongest evidence in San José's favor is that it has expanded capacity quickly. The city's own public materials show a large increase in sites and units in a relatively short period. For a city dealing with a highly visible unsheltered homelessness crisis, that is not a trivial accomplishment. It suggests the current strategy has succeeded at creating additional places where people can come indoors, even if it has not solved every downstream problem. ([City of San José](#))

Source URL:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

The more mixed question is how well the system is converting temporary shelter into permanent housing exits. The San Francisco Chronicle reported that San José's temporary housing served 2,135 people last year and that among those who exited, 30% entered affordable housing, while other exits went to another shelter system, institutional settings, or unsubsidized homes. That does not mean the system is failing, but it does suggest that adding shelter capacity and generating permanent exits are not the same thing, and the city still needs stronger flow-through into lasting housing. ([San Francisco Chronicle](#))

Source URL:

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/matt-mahan-added-1-000-shelter-beds-in-san-jose-22154345.php>

San José also appears to be confronting a predictable second-phase challenge: high operating costs. San José Spotlight reported that the city estimates it could reduce operating costs at tiny-home villages by about 15% by standardizing security, food, and property management, using CalAIM reimbursements for case management, and getting Santa Clara County to pay for more services. That is significant because it shows even city leadership appears to recognize that the next phase is not just expansion but operational optimization. ([San José Spotlight](#))

Source URL:

<https://sanjosespotlight.com/san-jose-looks-to-cut-homeless-shelter-operating-costs/>

A fair summary is that San José's current approach appears to be working best at expanding noncongregate capacity and offering more privacy than traditional shelter, while working less well on cost control and on moving people into permanent housing quickly enough. That is a more accurate conclusion than either praising the system as a full success or dismissing it as wasteful by definition. ([City of San José](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/matt-mahan-added-1-000-shelter-beds-in-san-jose-22154345.php>

<https://sanjosespotlight.com/san-jose-looks-to-cut-homeless-shelter-operating-costs/>

Refinements to what San José is already doing

One refinement would be to make the city's tiered approach explicit. Right now San José already has lower-intensity interim housing and much higher-cost modular interim housing, but the city could more clearly define which residents are best served by which model. The practical goal would be to avoid using the city's most expensive product for people who mainly need a lockable room, stability, and access to services rather than a more apartment-like unit. ([City of San José](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

<https://knowledge.uli.org/-/media/files/case-studies/2024/lifemoves-branham-lane.pdf>

Another refinement would be to strengthen site-by-site public reporting. Since San José already has a public dashboard and progress page, the next step is not creating measurement but improving it. The city should publish clearer comparisons of cost per occupied bed, average length of stay, exits to permanent housing, maintenance downtime, and utilization by project type so the Council can tell which sites produce the best value. ([City of San José](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/data-key-performance-indicators>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

A third refinement would be to continue and deepen the city's own stated cost-control efforts. Because San José is already looking at standardizing shelter operations, increasing CalAIM reimbursements, and seeking more county support for services, your paper can fairly say this is not an outside accusation but a direction the city itself appears to view as necessary. The refinement is to formalize that work, report on it publicly, and show whether the promised savings actually materialize. ([San José Spotlight](#))

Source URL:

<https://sanjosespotlight.com/san-jose-looks-to-cut-homeless-shelter-operating-costs/>

A fourth refinement would be to treat low-cost land arrangements as a repeatable strategy rather than a one-off success. Via del Oro demonstrates that land partnerships can help lower project cost, even when overall capital and operating costs remain substantial. San José should identify where similar public, philanthropic, institutional, and faith-owned sites could be assembled earlier in the planning process instead of negotiated ad hoc project by project. ([HomeFirst](#))

Source URL:

<https://www.homefirstscc.org/news-story/san-jose-s-first-tiny-home-village-on-private-land-already-half-full>

What San José could still implement

San José does not appear, from the sources reviewed here, to have clearly implemented the Vancouver-style co-located parking-lot extension model in which very small structures are placed next to an existing staffed shelter so they can share bathrooms, showers, laundry, meals, and support staff. Vancouver's 2022 pilot report estimated a preferred co-located option at about \$28,000 per unit, compared with about \$55,000 to \$70,000 per unit for a more self-contained parking-lot model. The point is not that San José could copy Vancouver dollar for dollar, but that co-location with existing services can materially reduce cost. ([Vancouver City Council](#))

Source URL:

<https://council.vancouver.ca/20220209/documents/cfsc3.pdf>

San José could also implement a more formal public-land pipeline. The city has already shown that partner-site development is possible, but it could go further by working systematically with county agencies, transit agencies, utilities, school districts, hospitals, and faith institutions to identify low-cost or idle land before projects are designed. This would make siting less reactive and could reduce both land

cost and project delay. That recommendation follows from San José's own experience as well as from comparison-city practice. ([HomeFirst](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.homefirstscc.org/news-story/san-jose-s-first-tiny-home-village-on-private-land-already-half-full>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

San José could also borrow more from lower-cost standardized shelter models, while being honest about their limits. LIHI in Seattle says the material cost of one tiny house is about \$4,500 and describes the model as relying on volunteers, local government land, and operating support. San José should not assume that figure is a realistic all-in California city cost, but it can still learn from the principles behind it: small standardized structures, simple layouts, repeatable procurement, and strong operating partnerships. ([Low Income Housing](#))

Source URL:

<https://www.lihihousing.org/tinyhouses>

Another idea San José could still implement is a stronger public framework for deciding who gets which interim-housing offer and why. That would help the city defend itself against accusations of arbitrariness and would make the system easier to evaluate for fairness and efficiency. I have not verified a single official city framework in the sources reviewed here that fully lays out this prioritization in a way ordinary residents can easily follow, so this recommendation is best understood as a governance improvement rather than a criticism of any one site. ([City of San José](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

San José could also state more clearly that interim housing is a bridge rather than an endpoint, and then align budgets and metrics around that principle. The Chronicle's reporting on exit outcomes suggests the city still needs stronger movement into permanent housing. If the city expands temporary capacity without improving housing exits, then a better shelter system can gradually become a holding system. That is why improved shelter operations and improved permanent-housing flow have to be pursued together. ([San Francisco Chronicle](#))

Source URLs:

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/matt-mahan-added-1-000-shelter-beds-in-san-jose-22154345.php>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

Conclusion

San José has already implemented many of the core elements of a modern interim-housing strategy: rapid capacity expansion, multiple noncongregate shelter types, partner-supported siting, and public performance reporting. The city's problem is not that it has done nothing. Its problem is that the first phase of building capacity now has to be followed by a second phase focused on cost control, better site matching, clearer performance comparisons, and stronger exits into permanent housing. That is a much stronger and more credible argument to present to the City Council than either blanket praise or blanket condemnation. ([City of San José](#))

Thank you Brian Darby

Source URLs:

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

<https://sanjosespotlight.com/san-jose-looks-to-cut-homeless-shelter-operating-costs/>

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/matt-mahan-added-1-000-shelter-beds-in-san-jose-22154345.php>

References

City of San José, Progress and Outcomes Over the Past 18 Months: Addressing Unsheltered Homelessness

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/data-key-performance-indicators-copy>

City of San José, Interim Housing Communities

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/homelessness-response/interim-housing-communities>

HomeFirst, San Jose's first tiny home village on private land already half full

<https://www.homefirstscc.org/news-story/san-jose-s-first-tiny-home-village-on-private-land-already-half-full>

Urban Land Institute, LifeMoves Branham Lane case study

<https://knowledge.uli.org/-/media/files/case-studies/2024/lifemoves-branham-lane.pdf>

San José Spotlight, San Jose looks to cut homeless shelter operating costs

<https://sanjosespotlight.com/san-jose-looks-to-cut-homeless-shelter-operating-costs/>

City of Vancouver, Creating a Tiny Shelter Pilot Project

<https://council.vancouver.ca/20220209/documents/cfsc3.pdf>

Low Income Housing Institute, Tiny Houses

<https://www.liihousing.org/tinyhouses>

San Francisco Chronicle, Matt Mahan added 1,000 beds for the homeless in a year

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/matt-mahan-added-1-000-shelter-beds-in-san-jose-22154345.php>

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