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Good afternoon everyone, welcome to the meeting of August 29th, 2017. Today’s invocation will be delivered by the lokahi Polynesian dance group. Introduced by Councilmember Nguyen.

Thank you mayor. This will be the best part of the meeting I guarantee you. The lokahi Polynesian are dance group was established in 1989. And the group since then grown there having only a handful of dancers to an organization that has taught hundreds of youth to dance. They have a wide range of dancers that range from three years old to dancing grandmothers. Don't give up hope yet! And they have been featured on ABC 11, living well Expo, reaching waters, Bay Area Vista. With notable performances at Disneyland Polynesian cultural night. The dance group has been prominent in the Bay Area, performances at local schools, private parties, corporate events and community events. Lokahi is led by Rebecca fabro. The group was led by Pamela, today we have Rebecca Rachel Raylene and Judith. Please welcome all the performers to the podium please. Thank you. [applause]

Thank you very much. Please rise for the pledge of allegiance.

Does anyone have any changes to the printed agenda? We do have a request to defer item 4.3 to November 14th. We do need a motion.

So moved.

Second.

All right, I have no cards from the public. Let's vote. On to the closed session report. Mr. City Attorney.

I have no report but I believe the City Manager does.

He does indeed. Norberto.
Norberto Duenas: Thank you mayor councilmembers, I am delighted to state that the city council approved my appointment of John Aiken as the next director of San José Mineta international airport. [applause]

Norberto Duenas: John has been serving as interim director for the last four months, following the departure of Kim Becker in March. John has been with San José since 1993. And during his tenure he successfully led the airport team in redesigning both the airport strategic plan and the airport technology plan. He held a key leadership role in operating the airport's $1.3 billion modernization of two terminals completed in 2010. I appreciate that John not only brings expert knowledge of the airport but he also understands our departments at City Hall. He knows and enjoys our San José communities as well having worked in the area since 1969. John earned a bachelor's degree and MBA from Embry riddle aeronautical agency. And accreditation, and certified from the federal aviation administration both as a commercial pilot and certified flight instructor in single and multi-engine instrument aircraft. John is well positioned to lead the airport team and direct the growth of the airport, considered to be the nation's fastest growing airport. Please join me in congratulating John. [applause]

Mayor Liccardo: I know that John is also joined here by his wife Angela and daughter Sabrina ah. Right? Thank you for your support of John. [applause]

Mayor Liccardo: Thanks John you got the mic.

Thank you. I was doing fine until the applause and he nowite a slight bit nervous compared to what I was about three minutes ago. So thank you for that. But we'll go through this. Mr. Mayor, madam Vice Mayor and city council members. First I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity and trusting me to lead one of our City's most strategic and valuable assets. I look forward to working together to develop the airport in alignment with the city's vision. The airport has entered a time of remarkable growth. Which comes with its own facility and customer service challenges. But I also see these growth challenges as an opportunity to bring creative and exciting airport improvements to you that will prepare for our continued success. And my thanks to Norberto and Dave. For mentoring, preparing and believing in me. And supporting me for this opportunity to serve the city and the airport. Aviation is not just my job. It's truly my passion. And spending the last 25 years pursuing my passion with the city and SJC has been truly rewarding for me. A special thanks to the previous airport directors,
Ralph owner Tonseth, Bill Sherry and Kim Becker, for each role in my public development. I would like to thank my wife Angela and my daughter Sabrina and my daughter Nicole who lives in Louisiana. They helped me reach this news opportunity here at SJC. I would also like to thank senior staff from the airport and the entire airport team for their hard work and dedication to the airport and to our community. Which makes my job even more fulfilling. In closing, it's truly an honor to stand before you, before my wife and daughter, the senior staff from the airport, and the community, to accept this opportunity to lead the great team at the airport. A team that truly loves the airport and works together to make great things happen daily for our community and our customers. Thank you. [applause]

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you John for your service, we look forward to your service special thanks go to the camera team led by Vicky Day. We're on to the consent calendar. Are there any items that council would like to pull from consent? I believe, Councilmember Rocha, you would like to pull 2.14 and 2.15, is that right?

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you mayor, I've since talked to staff, and I'm good.

>> Mayor Liccardo: So they'll stay on consent. Any other items to be pulled?

>> The Clerk: I believe you have a speaker card.

>> Mayor Liccardo: I do on 2.14. Gail Osmer we can pull the item if council chooses but you can certainly speak now. This is on the path item.

>> Hi, good afternoon, by name is Gail Osmer. I wanted to thank you for increasing the funding to path and which provides services for outreach to the homeless. The funding has increased by $260,000. And the reason I'm speaking is, I really want to make sure that there is an oversight committee or an oversight department, that will stay on track, to make sure path is doing what their contract and/or agreement states. There has been some nonprofits that aren't doing what they're supposed to be doing. And through their contract. But I've heard some good things about path, since we have over 4,000 homeless people I know they can't be getting to all of them but maybe instead of a 10%, I know there's 10% clients that have received or they want to receive permanent housing. With this new agreement, maybe we can
increase that to a little bit higher. But we got a good oversight committee for the path, nonprofit. Thank you.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you Gail. Okay. If any councilmember would like to pull that item we do so. If not we'll vote on the balance of the consent calendar. I wanted to take special notice of this. Our ongoing efforts, as you know we created an office of strategic partnerships, led by con Rousseau, and a small team led by Shereen Santosium. We're doing everything we can to bring resources into the city. We've got a scarce budget and we have to see how we can leverage bright people and resources from around the globe to help us. In this case we were able to land an IBM smarter cities challenge grant competing with cities throughout the country. IBM is donating of the worth half a million dollars. In concrete terms, they are giving us half a dozen of their star employees for a few weeks and they're going to help us get our rent registry up and running and our affordable housing portal up and running which we know needs a lot of work. We are grateful to the housing department to be open to working in this way. I really want to thank Shereen, she's in Washington, D.C. right now, for us, but also thank con Rousseau, and Henry Tsi, he's with us for a year, a limited time unfortunately just a year on a fellowship but we're grateful to have his good work here at the city as well. So if there's any comment we can take that at this time or we can entertain a motion. Let's vote. We'll mooch on to the regular agenda. First we'll recess the regular meeting, what every kid would like, go right to recess. Convene the Successor Agency of the Redevelopment Agency. On the consent calendar of the Successor Agency.

>> Councilmember Peralez: Move approval of the consent calendar.

>> Mayor Liccardo: There is a motion, if there is any comment I have no cards. Let's vote. That is 9:1.

>> The Clerk: I actually hit end before Tam Nguyen voted. If you could hit proceed.

>> Mayor Liccardo: We're going to reconvene the city council, hello again everybody, we're now going to start with the report of the City Manager, Norberto.

>> Norberto Duenas: Thank you mayor and councilmembers, I wanted to let all of you know that at 7:00 a.m. this morning, seven members of our search and rescue team arrived in San
Antonio, Texas as part of a FEMA based water rescue team, officially called the California urban search and rescue task force 3 that is sponsored by the Menlo park district. Menlo Park is part of the team when approved by the state Governor's Office of emergency services, governor Brown provided his approval this weekend. There are 28 such regional teams in the nation, representing over 1100 trained rescue personnel and providing 64 specialized rescue boats. All 28 regions have now responded to the call from FEMA and all 1100 plus personnel have or will soon arrive in Texas to assist. This is the first time since Hurricane Katrina in 2005 where a disaster has called upon each and every Interstate team. Additionally, to assist the rescuer, Texas governor Greg Abbott has called the entire Texas national guard about 12,000 troops to work with the coast guard and national guard units from five states. As we have been seeing in the news the extremely heavy and extensive flooding caused by tropical storm Harvey has made this necessary. As of this morning, weather service has estimated that enough rain has fallen in southern Texas enough to fill all the stadiums for NFL and AFL 100 times more rain is on the way. Shelters are opened in dozens of communities poop mega shelter for 5,000 people, opened at the Houston convention center, it's now holding more than 9,000. A mega shelter has opened and military aircraft have begun transporting people from Houston to Dallas. Residents are expected to need temporary shelter in the coming days. Our six San José men on the California task force 3 team are working with eight rescue personnel from across the cities of Palo Alto, San Mateo and south San Francisco and from the fire districts for central San Mateo county and Menlo park. While this team arrived in San Antonio this morning we know FEMA will move them to the area of greatest need upon their arrival. Their deployment is scheduled to last up to 14 days but as we saw with Hurricane Katrina it could possibly last longer. Fire chief Jacobsen and I will keep you apprised as we find out additional information. Please I ask that you hold task force 3 and all rescue teams and troops in your thoughts and prayers, that they are successful in saving lives and that all may return safely to their homes after their heroic work accomplished. Thank you.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you, Norberto and our thoughts go out to those six, along with their families, and to all those who are doing all they can to save lives in Houston. The good news is, we're sending some pretty good people since they managed to get about 350 in San José in harm's way without any loss of life. They know what they're doing. All right we're back to item 3.3 which is statement of policy and questions to the respective director of community energy. There are any questions or comments or a motion?
>> Move approval.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Councilmember Khamis.

>> Councilmember Khamis: What is your plan for ensuring that you maintain good communications with the mayor and the city council, I'd like the question to state what is your plan for maintaining good communications with the residents/customer. Another question that I would like to do maybe after 12 or however you put it, how will you ensure that the City's low price commitment to residents to stay equal or cheaper than PG&E rates. How will you keep that commitment. And as far as -- it expresses -- those two things express my other items.

>> Mayor Liccardo: I don't believe there is a commitment mandated by the council that the rates will be lower than PG&E's. I know we are clearly designing one of the plans to be as cost competitive as possible and certainly based on persons it has been lower than PG&E's based on other community CCE programs. But I don't think it's a commitment, because I don't think we can make that commitment based on availability of markets.

>> Councilmember Khamis: A low cost plan equal or lower than.

>> Mayor Liccardo: I don't believe it was a commitment. I believe the idea was we would have a competitive programming with PG&E. And certainly, I know that the desire of council is to have that be lower than PG&E. But I don't believe there is a commitment that it has to be lower or equal. And the reason I say that, I believe that is an impossibility for anybody to manage an energy market that way.

>> Councilmember Khamis: I have to say I think we put it in the memo that we passed and I remember specifically calling it out, that we should have a low-cost plan.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Yes low-cost, absolutely.

>> Councilmember Khamis: So, you know, I don't think I've -- I don't think I've misunderstood since I wrote the memo.

>> Mayor Liccardo: I think you have misunderstood.
>> Dave Sykes: Mr. Mayor, how could this candidate ensure that they are adhering to the council direction with regard to rate. We could certainly frame a question around that.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Certainly. Other questions? I would just ask to have a question included, which would inquire about, given the fast-changing nature of energy markets, how does this person plan on ensuring that they and others on their team will be doing all they can do to learn from the experience of other CCE programs, and from experts, to ensure that they are up on the latest information and methods to manage and procure energy.

>> Councilmember Khamis: I just want to make sure that my question was included --

>> Mayor Liccardo: I believe it was suggested with slight modification by Dave.

>> Councilmember Khamis: I hope we can all reference the memo we passed because I'm not under any -- I've read it before this meeting, so I know what we passed and it was a commitment to have a low-cost plan that is equal to or less than PG&E. And that's what the memo stated verbatim.

>> Mayor Liccardo: I'm happy to discuss it another time but it's not going to be fruitful to debate it on the dais. Councilmember Arenas.

>> Councilmember Arenas: Thank you mayor, I have follow up questions. Number 4, describe your long term plan for dealing with disadvantaged communities that may benefit from local clean energy investments. And then also to follow memo question number 5, in what ways do you see yourself and or the community energy department developing opportunities to accelerate the clean energy adoption. And lastly, supplementing memo number 8, how can CED clean energy environmental plans to densify housing, bring improvements to public transportation.

>> Mayor Liccardo: So the maker of the motion what is who, Councilmember Peralez? Do you want to incorporate those?

>> Councilmember Peralez: Yes, I'm okay.
Mayor Liccardo: And the seconder originally from my left, the seconder before, okay, this was a seconder before Councilmember Khamis.

The Clerk: I only heard Khamis.

Mayor Liccardo: That's fine. Any other questions? All right, 4.4 vacation of a portion of West Julian between autumn and autumn arc way. We do not have a presentation. On the motion let's vote unless there are any questions. All right that passes unanimously. Item 4.5, real property Almaden and Carlyle street. Councilmember Peralez.

Councilmember Peralez: Thank you, I don't believe there is a presentation on this one. Community members in the audience --

Mayor Liccardo: To you want me to call those down?

Councilmember Peralez: Please.

Tom, followed by (saying names).

I'm Tom Wolmot, I live at 38 north Almaden boulevard, next to the property in question and I'm a local historian. I think it's important that the councilmembers understand that this is a very significant part of our history as resides in this area. I also have a document that I'd like to put in the record as well. First of all, the college of Notre Dame was founded there in 1851. It was the first college for women, in the West, and we had royalty from Hawaii, people from Canada, from all over the West came to study there for women's baccalaureate degree. Besides that 1956, about 60 years ago, IBM had a facility there where they invented the magnetic disk drive. It revolutionized and changed computers forever. The building is still standing, IEEE designated it as a historic site, we are Silicon Valley, after all. Finally as the mayor knows I think your grandfather had a store there and he painted a sign. But my point about all of this is that buildings are infused with value because of the accomplishments that people make in them. Just like this building here, you are making significant accomplishments and it's worth preserving. 60 years from now when we're all gone what will we remember? A great building, no. We'll remember what people did and that's what people will come to these
sites and acknowledge them. For me I think it's important to develop this site, I'm for that but also for preserving some of the historical value so you can benefit by having people see these things and come and appreciate them. Once it's gone and you have a brass plaque, that's all you will have so thank you very much.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you Tom and thank you for remembering. Welcome.

>> Good afternoon. Due the time constraints I'm going to read my speech, make it go much faster. But my name Hanif Ismael, board president of the access building right next to the lot that is being proposed for sale today. We are not here to try to stop the development from occurring in our backyard. Instead we want to see better use for this entire block. The block which is unique in that it bridges San Pedro market, little Italy and SAP center, as a result, it has tremendous foot traffic that can be leveraged for commercial use. When you think about the concept of live, work and play, live, we're making a lot of progress. There's 6,000 plus residential units under construction or planning stage. That's about 12,000 people. San Pedro market cannot handle that many people. From a work perspective, the city council's doing amazing. Adobe is expanding. Potentially google may move here. So we're well underway there. From a play perspective, to have a true modern urban lifestyle, we need more than restaurants and bars. We need social activities. Otherwise, residents go to neighboring cities, to bowl or watch a movie, for example. The city doesn't lose just that $1 for the movie, but the -- but we lose more than four to fiveX of that revenue because we ate drank and did other activities at that city as well. Retail location can generate 54% more in incremental city tax revenue than a multifamily residential unit. In summary, we ask the city council to designate this block for a modern entertainment complex as opposed to another residential building, where there are many alternative sites for this.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you sir.

>> Make it a destination where not only residents go but it draws people from neighboring cities.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you. Thank you very much. If you want to submit the petition to the clerk then it can be distributed. Thank you. Welcome.
Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Tony Gutierrez. I'm the general manager of access condominium building. Our board president was an interested party, listed with the city, on June 3rd, 2014, Jamie Dickinson acknowledged in writing that there was an error in their part in omitting him from the bidding process and apologized. An apology is not sufficient for a missed opportunity. Dan Orlando was also omitted from the process, and you have to wonder how many others had missed an opportunity to bid on this property. Kim Walesh cites a code section that allows a public bidding process in 2014 in which at least two registered bidders were excluded from that process. So the assertion of the city was that they wanted someone to buy up the entire block and develop it. Kim Walesh's memorandum also states, the current bid inner a meeting facilitated by councilmember Raul Peralez office, the purchaser stated they are in the farming business, they're not in -- they're not a builder and they intend to sell the property to somebody else to develop it. So the sale does not meet what was intended by the public bidding. Why can't others be given the same right to participate in the financial investment? So we assert that the current bid be cancelled, the bidding process be reopened for public to participate and thus remove any partiality. Thank you.

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you very much. I don't know if anyone is here from OED. Kim or Nancy. Thank you. Just to address the concern that was raised last. My understanding is, the law routinely allows for the city or any public agency to sell in a direct sale process to someone who owns an adjacent parcel because there's generally opublic policy recognizing that can you do a whole lot more with parcels that are aggregated than are broken up in lots of small pieces. Is that more or less what happened here?

Nancy Klein: Absolutely mayor. And just to also note there were multiple times we went out in the middle of this process. We were looking at the surplus land policy. But of note, so there were starts and stops to this. But also, of note, on the posting, on the side of the fence, were multiple signs saying, name to call, et cetera. So it was well-known who to put the information into, and that the property was up for sale.

Mayor Liccardo: Okay. Terry, did you want to add anything?

Nancy Klein: Newspaper, it was published in the newspaper.
Mayor Liccardo: So we followed the rules here. I appreciate Tom coming to recite a little history. It was in fact the parking lot to my grandfather’s little market there which was called the Notre Dame market, I think he named it after the college and the street there and he painted the sign you can read if you are coming from Henry’s high life, it says, parking cost 25 cents. Those were the good old days weren’t they? His one great artistic contribution to the city will likely get demolished. He wasn’t too much of a painter so he won’t worry too much about that. Any further comment or question. Okay. Councilmember Peralez.

Councilmember Peralez: Thank you, mayor. And thank you staff for presentation to the community members for coming out. And sorry, the protocol, the two minutes is up, we do want to be able to follow that.

Mayor Liccardo: I’m sorry, sir. It’s Councilmember Peralez’s --

Councilmember Peralez: I do understand and respect what it is the community members have come out for. Directly reaching out to Hanif himself and other community members, I know we followed process that we legally have to and the posting was there and there was an opportunity but I do think we have a community member come forward that had an interest that had other ideas and wanted just a fair shot of being able to purchase property. Has not done that before with the city. So someone that was unfamiliar with that process. Not a developer, right? And so I think that the -- our omission, and as was apologized to, to have sort of that direct connection, although we followed the -- all the legal postings that we had to, and put this in the Mercury News, I myself was not happy that that happened. And that this individual did not get that chance to have that opportunity. Nonetheless have had an opportunity to be able to not only discuss with Hanif but the access residents as well as yourself and the Rovinos family as well, I know they did attend a meeting because this came about without really -- I hadn’t had a chance to talk to the Rovinos myself, we wanted to put this on pause before the July break. I was glad we did. The only difference I would say from the comment that was made, I think the Rovinos don’t know exactly what they want to do yet but their intent they told me is add something with housing. I would agree, honey if I were able to see the letter you posted at access. I agree on this issue, we don’t just want housing downtown. San Pedro market is an example. They are not 100% convinced what they want to do. I think there’s an opportunity moving forward and that next phase which will be now having a conversation, I want to be able to bring the Rovino to not only access but the other community members.
around there to have conversations what we can do around here. Can I tell you there is no intent to change the land use to then restrict what could be there. That's what's helped our downtown grow. That's what's helped the high rises to spring up. We knew we needed that. Prior to me even being on the council we opened up those doors. We made it very easy to open up downtown, so people can put office space or housing or you name it. It's not really coordinated very well so I would agree with that but don't necessarily agree that today is the date to make those restrictions on it. I know I had a good conversation with the Rovinos and the community is aware, they are willing to now leave the dog park as a dog park in the interim which we found out at the meeting in June that their intent was to maybe turn it over into temporary parking. And certainly that's not a good start. So I appreciate them for being able to work with us and the downtown association and the neighbors to be able to do that. Because that's a benefit to access residents and those that have dogs in the downtown that don't have many opportunities to use places like that. So I'm glad that it was a good start. Glad I had a good conversation with the Rovinos, glad the decision went forward and have it known to community members here, we're going to have a conversation and hopefully agree with what to best put up in this site, so with that I'll make the motion to approve the sale.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Motion by Councilmember Peralez. I just want to thank everyone who came down to speak and I agree with everything Councilmember Peralez said. And obviously appreciate that we could have done a better job in reaching out at the outset to the community. What I would encourage community members to do, at access and other buildings, to the extent you're involved with the downtown residents association already, being able to clearly signal to other property owners, for example that site over at camera 12, clearly strong community input saying we really want to see a theater here, to know it can be reflected in a market is helpful. As they are thinking what to do at that specific sites and those sites where we have the opportunity for theaters or entertainment venues of various kinds. So we would be happy to work with you in our office, to ensure that if there are collective efforts to get the sentiment of residents for property owners and brokers to know about it we're very happy to do it. Because I think like Councilmember Peralez, I spent a lot of years trying to encourage more entertainment options here in the downtown. And we know it's heavy lifting until you have a very large critical mass of residents, until you build the downtown neighborhood and we're a few towers off from that at this point. It is just very difficult to get retail and restaurants and bowling alleys and whatever it may be to take that risk. We have to keep doing all of the above. Any other comments or questions? Let's vote.
Mayor Liccardo: All right that passes unanimously. We're on to item 7.1. We're going to have a joint staff presentation between San José energy and the council financing authority agenda. Is that right? We can call the agenda and still have a joint -- Rick says we can do that. Call to order the San José city council financing authority. We don't need roll call, do we? Okay good we'll dispense of that. Commercial paper program to finance San José clean energy which requires two-thirds vote by the way and we'll hear at the same time actions on 7.1. Hi Kerrie and hi Dave.

Dave Sykes: Mr. Mayor, we'll get started, joined by Kerrie Romanow and Julia Cooper. On August 8th our most recent actions the council established the Department of Community energy. At that meeting we also sought input from the council on the draft implementation plan, the draft staffing plan and the community advisory committee. As the mayor mentioned today we're hearing items jointly between the joint city council City of San José financing authority item 2, items relevant to that and also items on the regular city council agenda. With regard to the items on the financing authority, there's two items there. These allow issuance of the commercial paper to finance the startup costs. And as the player mentioned these items will require a two-thirds vote from the council. Getting into the staff recommendations, in essence, we're requesting a public hearing to approve the implementation plan. We're requesting approval of an ordinance to establish the San José clean energy operating fund. We are requesting approval of budget actions for operating fund. And we’re also requesting approval of our staffing plan, for the startup of the department. Catching up here. Also seeking approval of the framework for community advisory committee and then approve amendments to the consultant agreement that we've been utilizing. So Kerrie and Julia are going to go through some details and then we'll get your inputs.

Kerrie Romanow: Thanks Dave. So you may recall on August 8th we brought the draft implementation plan to council and we've been working internally as well as with external consultants since known finalize the document. Recall that the implementation plan is a template plan, rights of program participants et cetera and the CPUC has certified eight implementation plans so far and they generally have the same content and structure. Recall that this document includes our best information to date. We are able to update it through a letter process, over time, as that's needed. The implementation plan has to be adopted at a public hearing by council and we hope to submit the plan to the CPUC in mid-September after
the San José clean energy establishing ordinance is fully executed and then CPUC has 90 days to review this document.

>> Julia Cooper: Good afternoon. With respect to the financing plan you have before you today, approval of the issuance of commercial paper notes not to exceed $10 million for start justify costs, we're expecting those startup costs to be only $5.4 million. We wanted to create a buffer in case there was extension in getting the program up and running, we wouldn't have to come back to the council to ask for that increase. The commercial paper program is backed by the General Fund. As we presented in August we believe it is the most flexible and best financing plan for the city with respect to financing the startup costs. We are taking into account the no outlay of General Fund money, this is bridge financing until we get to more permanent financing and revenues generated by San José clean energy. Any future financing would have a priority to refinance the commercial paper in addition to providing that working capital during the launch phases. The City's commercial paper program was established in 2004 and it does provide a quick and easy access to funds and to provide this kind of bridge financing for the city. We only issue the commercial paper notes as needed. So we don't issue the full $5 million up front. We only do it as needed, so that helps keep the cost down as well. And it's secured by a number of city assets. Cost of program total capacity of $85 million. In terms of future financing, public financial managements is a municipal advisory firm. They've been selected through a competitive process to assist the city in developing the working capital financing plans. So we're close to executing agreement with them. And then the estimated $50 million in working capital financing is expected to be enough through fiscal year 18-19, it will provide capital during those launch phases and then also redeem the commercial paper. So that helps with the objective of minimizing the risk to the City's General Fund. So that objective with the working capital financing is that repayment will come solely from the enterprise revenues. With that I'll turn it back, oh I forgot budget. Margaret and Jennifer are not available. In terms of the budget actions, we are requesting authorization to recognize $5.4 million coming from the commercial paper proceeds which would be available to pay for the personal services, nonpersonal, the bonding, PG&E deposit, also the debt service on the commercial paper notes that we issue, and then also create an operations and maintenance reserve. So those are partly of the all encompassing actions that you have before you today.
>> Kerrie Romanow: Thank you. In regards to staffing, the director recruiting is well underway and we expect to bring you a recommendation late September to October this year. Seven additional staff five in the community energy department, those would be hired between September and November and then two staff in the city attorney’s office we’re expecting that around November. Additional staffing would be included in the additional budget action. When were talking about San José clean energy there was a lot of conversation how the community might be involved and the team has framed up a community advisory committee. Want to specifically recognize Kelly Morris for work she has done in scanning all the city committees and what works, what doesn't, coming up with a really sound recommendation for where this new advisory committee should land. So there will be nine members that would reflect the diversity of San José and advise the City Manager, mayor and council. Six in public advocacy Klein energy community engagement and include representation from one or more of the following, industry labor education nonprofits and environmental association he. These six members would be reviewed and recommended by the council appointment advisory commission and three additional members would be at large appointments by the mayor. It could also include one nonvoting council liaison member. We expect to establish the community advisory committee before Thanksgiving of this year and that would be before we bring forward material policy recommendations. We would -- we also believe we need to add additional funding to EES, the consulting firm that's been helping us through this process that they drafted the business plan and they will also support our startup efforts. The master agreement ends on June 30th of 2018. We would like to add an additional $115,000 to bring it to a total of $405,000 to allow for continued technical support as we move towards the establishment and launch. So in regards to next steps, still a lot of work ahead of us. Recruit the community advisory committee members, finalize the power financing, submit the regulatory submittals to PG&E and CPUC, marketing efforts, director hiring, changes to title 26 and the data management scheduling and power contracts.

>> Dave Sykes: Thanks Kerrie. Just summarizing, these are the actions that need the two-thirds vote. And then remainder of the actions are just the majority vote. We're available for questions. Lethanks everybody. Great to see we're off and running. Just had one question. Putting back on your temporary budget director hat for a moment, Julia.

>> Julia Cooper: Don't tell Jennifer.
Mayor Liccardo: We won’t tell Jennifer. I know we have enterprise funds, WPCP funds, a financial wall, it sounds as though based on what I've read and heard, this is not technically an enterprise fund, General Fund is still potentially at risk.

Julia Cooper: In the initial stages, until that commercial paper note is paid off. But once that commercial paper note is paid off it will be a completely stand-alone operation with no fall back to the City's General Fund. That's why the expectation when we do the first working capital financing, the first item would be to pay back the commercial notes that have been drawn so we can get a pure commercial enterprise going. This is seed money because there is nothing to generate in the enterprise.

Mayor Liccardo: Very hex. Just ask my council colleagues and members of the community submit names to Scott Green, for names you would like to see on the community advisory commission. Councilmember Khamis.

Councilmember Khamis: Is there anybody from the public who would like to speak?

Mayor Liccardo: Not yet. We might have -- no.

Councilmember Khamis: I was reading your memo, we had a little confusion about the first item we just passed. But I want to bring your attention to executive summary under rates, which is the exact wording I just said about the question that I wanted posed to the director. Thank you for explicitly putting that in your memo. I appreciate that. I was wondering if I could actually recall that question and see if we can get my specific question included.

Mayor Liccardo: Councilmember Khamis the word you used was commitment. And what you see is a guiding framework and an offering of a power mix option. The word commitment has a pretty specific legal meaning. And I'm a bit concerned, if we're creating expectations that now General Fund and other funds will be at risk because we're making commitments about rates. And perhaps we can have a longer discussion offline. But that is the fundamental concern I have.

Councilmember Khamis: So we're polishing the word offer and commitment?
Mayor Liccardo: Yes, there's a pretty big difference. Commitment says it stays at that rate forever, that is at that rate or lower. And I'm not certain, I mean we can certainly have a long discussion about it now. But --

Councilmember Khamis: Well, we have a commitment to offer at least one fewer mechanism, that's the way I was saying. We have a commitment to offer one plan that has a rate that's equal to or less than PG&E. That is commitment I'm speaking to.

Mayor Liccardo: I understand. I just don't see the word commitment there.

Dave Sykes: The guiding framework is to offer a power mix with a rate equal to or less than PG&E's rates. That's the guiding framework that we'll be working under. So I think we can frame a question that will allow the candidate to respond to that guiding framework.

Councilmember Khamis: Okay, I just want to be clear that this is going to be part of our mix. That's why I voted for it. I want to make sure that it stays on as we intended it to stay on.

Dave Sykes: Absolutely that is intention to bring that back to council for approval.

Councilmember Khamis: Thank you.

Mayor Liccardo: Other questions? Okay. There is a motion. No, not yet. Okay we need a motion then.

City Attorney Doyle: Can I suggest we take two motions? One requires two-thirds. Financial and either order. And 7.1.

Mayor Liccardo: Let's take the financing authority item first, that requires two-thirds for passage. On that motion, Councilmember Jimenez. And is there a second here? Councilmember Arenas. Let's vote on that item. Okay. And now, that passes, we'll take 7.1, actions related to San José energy.

The Clerk: Same mover and seconder?
Mayor Liccardo: Oh is there a motion? Okay, Councilmember Diep. All right we’re forging ahead at breakneck speed to 10.4 which is the -- thank you everyone. The DDA that is disposition and development agreement on West San Carlos and market. We do have a staff presentation. And several members of the community would like to speak. I see the applicant as well, Dennis did you want to speak Al as well? Okay.

Nancy Klein: Mr. Mayor, we'll start with the presentation regarding the DDA and planning will join us. I think for a change we're a little quick.

Mayor Liccardo: Yes.

Nancy Klein: Pair and council, thank you very, very much. We look port to presenting this item on museum place. Let me make sure. The proposed museum place project was conceived of from the beginning of the building of this particular building. It was anticipated or hoped that expansion space would be needed because the building was very, very successful. And in fact that has been the case, particularly under the leadership of Tim Richie who is here with us today. The building was commissioned by former are redevelopment agency around designed by world renowned architect Ricardo Ligoretto who designed the CCM and Mexican heritage plaza. The domed facility is indeed a San José landmark and welcomes in excess of half a million visitors each year. Through programs such as the tech challenge an annual design competition that inspires youth, and the internationally renowned tech awards which honors people doing work to benefit humanity, the tech celebrates the present and encourages the development of innovative technology for a more promising future. The city, this shows you an aerial showing the tech museum, parkside hall and the Pacific national center. The city owns the tech museum along with the building next door. Prior to the expansion, parkside hall has been used for conventions trade shows, corporate events, and since that time, used less so sings of since the convention center definitely fills that need. The City's intent as mentioned earlier has always been to redevelop park side hall as the expansion of the tech museum, 1999 lease agreement with the tech as it stands today parkside hall is an aged building and really at the end of its economic life. This partnership with the tech museum and I warrant to importantly note in partnership and collaboration with Team San José, who is vital to make sure that we work collaboratively as a group and for the exiting, entrance, circulation for civic national, staff set out to form a public private partnership. Through that process insight realty emerged with what is a world class design and first of its kind in most mixed use project that
would be in the downtown. Named museum place, this is a modern 25 story high rise that would place the parkside hall with almost 1.4 million square feet of development. It will set a benchmark for density in the downtown. Museum place will give the tech almost 60,000 square feet of expansion space, and it also includes multiple other uses including an underground parking garage with at least 500 parking prays including 100 parking spaces allocated to the tech museum. And I wanted to put a fine note on this. The garage is intended ultimately to have 900 spaces. This is way we want to see garages built. There will be a limited number of spaces constructed, with mechanical units in. And valet park. This is what will hopefully lead us forward to use land more efficiently, and to have parking be less of an issue in the downtown. Four stories of large plate public offices will add 240,000 square feet of class a office and that will attract downtown tenants, luxury boutique hotel with Kimton as it's proposed operator and 300 for sale units. One of the important issues, when we were before you with the exclusive operating agreement was the inclusion of museum partners. Museum place will be built with union labor. The developer has followed through with an agreement, that has been accomplished and there are letters of support from unite here and the building trades in the mayor's packet or the agenda packet. As mentioned earlier, the projects had gone to Planning Commission and Planning Commission roted unanimously to recommend the museum place project. You'll hear more about CEQA and those related items in just a moment. And at this point, what we wanted to do is highlight some of the key items from the disposition and development agreement. I won't read to you everything that's on these pages but I wanted to make sure that the public had a very clear summary that is in the memo but this is an easier form to access. The city owns the property. It's about 2.2 acres. Parkside hall will be demolished. We need to go through the process of the property that is, and I'm going to show you a picture of this in a second, the alleyway or Almaden Avenue needs to come to the city, it is a Sara owned property. This was that 60-foot area which has previously been Almaden Avenue which we need to work through Sara process as we go forward. In addition in the development agreement, we had as mentioned union labor for construction of the building. Union labor for operation and maintenance of the hotel. We include 250,000 square feet of public art. Parking we already discussed and that the project will pay the standard fees. Insight will have first right of refusal. Let me make sure I highlight. The roughly 60,000 square feet that will be the tech museum expansion space will in effect be a condo unit that the city will own. Another point within the disposition and development agreement is the ability that within the uses of the building, the developer has the ability in the initial draft of the DDA, to reallocate spaces. This was an item that was further modified or seeks to be further
modified in mayor and councilmembers’ note blue memo to the project. And we are talking about the proposed formation of a community facilities district to finance the public improvements, specifically, the offsite and the tech museum improvements. With at a I'm going to turn this to Bill Ekern.

>> Thank you Nancy, members of the city council. Just a few key points on this schedule to put this in context. First, the city needs to acquire title of Almaden avenue in order to transfer that property to the developer. We've given ourselves about four months to work our way through the Sara process. Assuming the developer chooses to move forward, that would start the effective date that you see in this calendar of events. Within a year of the effective date the developer would be in the ground doing work with the utilities and other things. In order to enable the operations of the tech museum and the other properties surrounding that. After that, within another year, they would be in place for application for their building permits and pull the building permits so that within two years, with looking at the design and the time lines that it takes to go through the process to design a building of this complexity, they would be starting construction of the tower building itself. We've given them several years up to four years to complete the project, again given its complexity, I will be frank I don't think it will take that long and neither does developer but with the recognition of the complexities of the project it's wise to provide that level of flexibility going forward with the processes and just the construction issues. With that I will turn it back to Nancy.

>> Nancy Klein: Thank you Bill. The tech museum lease is very important, we have highlighted the lease amendments, the term will be the 55 years, the rent of the dollar, city to provide, we provide existing maintenance for the building, roughly, that the city takes care of structural items, and that the tech takes care of those items within the building itself. Tech has the abilities now to use McCabe hall. If that site McCabe hall should ever become the subject of a development site then we would work with the tech to either build them into that new site, or work with them to identify a space outside. The tech also, if for whatever reason they are not allowed to give up the tech space, they must stay. But in certain instances they could relinquish the expansion space and have the city either release to another entity or potentially sell as was discussed. We missed -- there is a slide that's supposed to be here that discusses the economic benefits. I don't want to leave that without mentioning them. The project will likely have at least a thousand employees, retail and hotel uses will be vibrant, as many as 700 construction jobs will come as a result, once complete, the building will be well in excess of
$400 million, the hotel Kimton hotel is estimated to generate taxes up to $1 million, again the developer will pay all fees that are standard in the city. I do want to turn this over to Tim Richie for a couple of words before we conclude our presentation on this part of the project. I just wanted to take a second to thank my teammates, Bill Ekern, Rosalynn, Tom Murtha gets the MVP, thank you for allowing me to do that. Tim.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Tim, I think it's not on. There you go.

>> Thank you, Nancy, Mr. Mayor and council. Maybe --

>> Mayor Liccardo: Why don’t you come around here Tim.

>> I'd like to enter or letter into the record which somehow didn't get there so I'm going to give this to the clerk. So in a brief word, the tech is on a roll right now and the museum place project will add to that roll. In 2014, the tech was recognized by the White House with the national medal which is the highest award to be given to a museum in the country. Since that time we've continued with this progress on a $100 million capital campaign. We've raised $50 million to that end. The museum project will be a big part of that. We'll try to raise another 20 just for the museum place project. But for us to be able to raise $50 million marines the community supports the tech and we're able to redo our exhibits and to hire great staff. And we're thinking with the future in mind, and museum place is a big part of that. Just this fall for instance we will host the international convention for our science centers worldwide 2,000 people will be coming to San José to Silicon Valley this fall we'll introduce two new breathtaking exhibits, body codes decoded and one on technology for global good. This is the kind of stuff the tech can do and the museum place project will add momentum to that. So briefly all I will say is the tech urges you to support the staff recommendation to approve the development disposition agreement and to authorize the staff to negotiate and execute the ancillary documents. There is not anything we don't believe can be worked out, there are a few technical items need to be resolved but it is a matter of time. We've agreed on a meeting of twice a month to resolve those issues. It has the full support of our board, our board vice chair was going to be with us today but was stuck in a meeting. So I'm speaking on behalf of the staff and on the board in support of the staff recommendation. Thank you.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you Tim. All right Nancy is that the conclusion?
>> Nancy Klein: Staff is here to respond to any questions. And I know that Rosalynn has a presentation on the CEQA related matters.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Rosalynn.

>> Rosalynn Hughey: Thank you mayor, Rosalynn Hughey, interim director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement. I think you’ve probably heard much about the wonderful mix of uses that are included in the project. 306 residential units with 19,000 square feet of ground floor retail. Over 200,000 square feet of office, museum space and 184 hotel rooms. Real briefly just wanted to talk about design for project staff worked very closely with the public comment in refining the design of the structure. It was a lot of effort put into this and we know that there was significant concern about the top of the building or what we refer to as the building crown. And naturally we have a guideline within our design guidelines that encourages the design of the tops of buildings to really add to the city skyline to views to and from each building. With that we are working with the applicant and adding as a condition of approval in the site permit and special use permit that staff -- the applicant would come back and staffer would look at further refinements to the building crown and we would be doing this as part of a permit adjustment, that would be handled prior to the issuance of building permits. Just also wanted to share we presented the project to the historic landmarks commission and they supported the historic landmarks consultant's conclusion that the project is compatible with the surrounding properties and does not adversely impact the civic auditorium. Directly or indirectly. In regard to the environmental clearance the circulation of the document was from February 14th to March 31st this year. We did receive about six comment letters that were addressed by staff, and required both a First Amendment and a second amendment. Do want to highlight that there is a shade and shadow issue, that the project projects on the nearby Cesar Chavez plaza, this is a significant and unavoidable impact and with council action today that the council would have to adopt a statement of overriding considerations. And lastly to note on community outreach we held a combined EIR scoping with the meeting that was held last December. As I mentioned we took the project to the historic landmarks commission back in October of last year and with that, that concludes staff report. Thank you.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Great thank you Rosalynn. I’m going to ask my colleagues indulgence for the moment, because we’ll be going to the parties this were conducting this agreement with
as well as the statements of the public in just a moment. But I'm going to need to run off for a meeting with senator Harris. I just wanted to, first, thank everyone for their hard work. This is a very complex project. Certainly the design is very attractive, the conceptual design and we look forward to seeing this happen. We wanted to express my support obviously for moving forward, this memorandum from several of us, Councilmember Peralez and Vice Mayor and Councilmember Khamis, myself, with regard to the recommendation about returning to council in March, I'm perfectly happy if that is simply an information memo rather than another hearing to save everybody a lot of work because you don't need more meeting. As the Schedule in attachment 4 of the DDA I would suggest that in addition to having day we have firm dates, because there are a lot of dates involved and I know it's going to get confusing and challenging. Folks can count differently depending whether it's a working day or not. Its would be good to speak clear on had a. The issue of financing is complex here. And difficult with this project. Because there are so many uses here. I want to ask Julia if she would be willing to come down and answer a few questions about the community facilities district. It is important for us to have our eyes wide open that there are still some things I believe that need to be worked out and this is essentially an agreement by the city to issue bonds for $34 million to finance a portion of this buildout. I believe for tech. Which obviously we definitely want to see as well as other cost offsite. And the question I have Julia in terms of implementation are there challenges or risks remaining in the formation of CFD?

>> Julia Cooper: There's a pretty elaborate process, to determine how the special tax to be spread among the property owners that are stacked within that development so that would be part of the analysis that would need to be undertaken so what portion of the tax burden would need to go to the residential versus the commercial versus the hotel, that would take place before we bring that back to council. So council would approve this special tax and how that tax gets spread as part of the formation of the CFD.

>> Mayor Liccardo: We have to establish the benefit to each of those property owners right?

>> Julia Cooper: It is a special tax, no direct benefit, it is a tax that is placed so the council has the authority to decide how they want to spread that tax among the various property uses.

>> Mayor Liccardo: We don't have to show any particular office owner or -- I understand this is going to be condominiumized out and going to be a lot of owners of this once it's all built.
Julia Cooper: So it will be part of that whole analysis we hire bond counsel to assist us in the formation, municipal advisor to assist us and a special advisor, how to do that.

Mayor Liccardo: Question will be when ownership transfers to many owners, what tax is going to be left to be paid or is it all going to be paid before the transfer.

Julia Cooper: Yes and some of the options other cities have used is requiring some of that to be paid off or stay as part of the transfer. To be part of the frame of work when you've asked us to come back in March with some analysis, we can ask our advisors with options you want to direct us to look at to come back with the final approval of the district itself.

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you Julia, appreciate what you're doing and look forward to seeing this move forward. With that I'll turn it over to Vice Mayor Carrasco.

Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, you will be back after the show. I appreciate that and so we'll go to public comment before I turn our council. Mr. Matt Mahood. Oh the applicant, Matt would you hold off for just a second. I'm sorry if the applicant has -- I think the applicant gets five minutes.

That's me, I'm Dennis Randall with insight realty. Mayor Liccardo, distinguished councilmembers, planning, economic development staff, planning staff, Tim Richie and Howard sung with the tech museum, Michael Mulcahy with Team San José, Enrique Fernandez, and Josue Garcia with the building trades council, four years ago my partners and I had a vision for Downtown San José, one that was shared by Downtown San José and City of San José. Our vision was based on the experience and detailed analysis that showed Downtown San José would become the next major beneficiary of the maturation and growth of San José. That maturation was rounded by three things, freeway transportation airport transportation and public transportation. That translates into location location location. Based on that understanding and vision we purchased ten acres from the Union Pacific railroad, phone as rail yard place. And we also pursue the opportunity o develop 180 park avenue, through the economic development known as museum place. These represent more than $1 billion in capital investment in Downtown San José. 25,000 square feet of entertainment retail and ownership 200 four star hotel rooms, a significant expansion to tech museum and significantly
increase to public parking but perhaps the motion important new vision is the expansion of the vision of the paseo which makes museum place the new center of downtown. It will also facilitate further development by our neighbors Mr. Rose and his partners which will further activate what we are now calling the theater district. So here we are four years later. Our vision has been justified. And validated by firms such as Adobe, Apple, Amazon, google and many others. Downtown has seen a resurgence like it hasn't seen before. Museum place is the perfect project to take advantage of the opportunities that Downtown San José now has before it. It is also a true public-private partnership if there ever was one, one that will facilitate the tech's new vision and fulfills our vision and promises to be a mark success. Perhaps even a model for all future development in downtown. However, the smashing success will require a constant collaborative commitment to this public-private joint endeavor between City Hall, insight around insight's private investors, private planning and private action. Museum place is much more than insight's project. That's because the City of San José has been a significant force in shaping this project financially and physically and with that leadership and shaping the project comes sheer commitment to its success and so we believe we're in this together and only together will we make this a smashing success. Insight deserves it. The City of San José deserves it. And most importantly, downtown San José needs it. Thank you very much, we're here to respond to any questions around we fully support the recommendations of staff and the memo. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much, Mr. Randall. I will now turn to the members of our audience. Mr. Matthew Mahood, Michael Mulcahy and Dave Cостайн.

>> Good afternoon. High as it goes. Good afternoon, Vice Mayor, members of the council staff, Matt Mahood, president and CEO of the Silicon Valley organization. I think my voice will be a voice of me too or us too organization. I'm here for our 1400 members and our 65 member board of directors to offer our support for the museum place as proposed today. This is best option for this parcel of land moving forward in this market cycles. It is an opportunity to transform and activate what is now a sleepy corner of the paseo in the heart of Downtown San José. New high tech office space a four star Kimton hotel, new executive housing to attract top talent, new restaurants and bars in the paseo, dining gathering and place making, increased property and T.O.T. taxation and expansion of the tech museum, no city subsidies, paying $21 million on city fees on current project first, this developer spent four years working
with city staff to get here today. San José is taking off. The SVO encourages your support and approval of this unique development opportunity here today. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much.

>> Madam Vice Mayor and city council members my name is Michael Mulcahy. I'm here with two hats today. First one is, as part of the larger development community. I want to congratulate and thank actually Dennis and insight King Wa llc. This is a gutsy project and you know it takes a lot to get to this place. This superblock under regulation, this is a superblock in Downtown San José which is really an incredible gateway with lots of future opportunity to come. I'm also here today as a four year immediate past chair of Team San José. We've submitted a letter which I'll turn in today as well. We've been a willing partner this this process. We manage your facilities that are immediately adjacent, after a major investment in the civic auditorium, it's really our job to be your eyes and ears on the ground to make sure you understand the impacts to the facilities you own and that you manage. Dennis and his team, Bill Ekern from the staff side have been incredibly cooperative, creative and doing the best by the facilities we manage, we look forward because this is really the starting line for really seeing how this block will develop with Dennis's project the paseo which is incredibly important as a gateway into our downtown through the convention facilities that we manage. It is incredibly exciting. This district is your entertainment convention district in downtown. Thank you very much.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you sir. Dave costain. Tim richie.

>> I'm Dave costain, development manager of Team San José. This project has the potential to be a real game changer. You're taking a block that has a renovated reactivateddity national civic and expanded tech museum, new hotel, officest and residents that are going to drive activation to the entire convention and cultural district downtown. We are work with city staff and the museum place development team throughout the process to help address the operational concerns that arise with any major development projects like this. We are committed to continuing to work with the city and the developer as the most critical phases are still ahead. TSJ is in full support of the are advancement of this project. We're excited about its potential and look forward to continuing to work with the developer and the city to bring the to is completion.
Good afternoon, Vice Mayor Carrasco, members of the council, Scott Knies, director of the downtown association. We talk about development a lot. Consider Museum place, it's got residential, office, retail, entertainment, hotel, a parking garage. It even has a museum facilities. This project broke the mold on mixed use. And it is a gutsy project as Michael Mulcahy said and it really does deserve our support because there's nothing like it in the City of San José that's been proposed. One of the real gems of this project is the paseo. We have very few north-south paseos in the downtown so linking park avenue to San Carlos street and keeping that open for retail, the pedestrians, all of the bikes, the google bikes that are coming to spill out there is going to be really important. It is a beautifully designed project by our downtown local architecture firm, steinberg. Their offices are a stone's throw from this project so they're going to look at it every single day. You know that they're putting their best effort into the project. It is incredible opportunity for the city. We urge your support of the staff recommendations today.

Good afternoon, Josh burrows, downtown advocate. I wants to say thank you to Dennis Randall and his team for bringing this vision to life. It is a true mixed use vision that our city deserves and a project that I wish was already built. The entire project is a community benefit and what I call a grand slam for Downtown San José. I hope we can approve today and I'd also ask that the council continues to support helping to expedite the remainder of the documentation and the paperwork so that we can get them to a building permit as soon as humanly possible. Thank you.

Good afternoon council, my name is Sandra Rodriguez, I'm here with unite here, the hotel workers union of San José. I'm speaking in place for Enrique Hernandez, the union's
president, who sends his regrets, he cannot be here. Local 19, people who work as house
keepers waiters cooks and other jobs in hotels, and corporate cafeterias here in downtown and
the rest of the Silicon Valley. Our members support the museum place project and urge you to
approve that project today. Bottom line we think that the museum place project willing be a
good development project for the City of San José. As you have been told earlier our union
has signed a labor peace agreement with insight realty and Kimton part of museum place.
That agreement is a good thing for our future hotel workers as well as the developer and our
union. We want to express our thanks to you and the city council for working with us to make
museum place a successful development project for everyone and we urge you to approve the
disposition and development agreement and other ideas today. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you.

>> Good afternoon. Vice Mayor, councilmembers. Representing 102 affiliated unions and
100,000 working men and women in this county. I want to sincerely thank city council for their
leadership on this issue. With the agreement made between unions and the projects
developer we can see what it means to see development agreements included in the project.
Without a project labor agreement, developer's goal ask to build a project they want to build,
the way they want to build it and make a profit. It comes from strong leadership from the policy
making body that we get agreements like were made today. I ask that the council approve the
memo put forth by Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Carrasco, Councilmember Khamis and
Councilmember Peralez. This is a big win for everyone involved. It sends a message to
developers and to the city that we can grow our milt class, thank you for your leadership.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you sir. Mr. Josue Garcia and Will Smith.

>> Good afternoon, Vice Mayor Carrasco and city council members. My name is Josue
Garcia, representing 26 construction unions and in Santa Clara County we have over 30,000
men and women work in the construction industry. And some of them are here to supports this
project. And if I can ask the members, because I don't think everybody nor we want everybody
to speak but I want them to show their support by standing all the men and women from the
trades. Thank you very much for being here and obviously many of them just came from work.
And many of them are still working. But we are here just to lend our full support for project.
Publicly, I would like to thank Mr. Dennis Randall, for his willingness to negotiate with us.
Because of the partnership between insight realty, the building trades council, members of the community will be able to have a good paying job. Opportunities for journey level people and also apprenticeship opportunities for those who want to enter the trades right out of high school or even if they don't have high school diploma, sometimes we have employment opportunities. But this is a perfect project. This is a partnership and our goal is to complete the project on time and on budget so the city can get what they want. The developer will get what they want, the community will benefit and also because the money will be staying local. Local businesses will benefit from this as well. I would like to thank one more time Dennis Randall for his willingness to talk to us and create a partnership between us and his organization and the building trades council.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you, Mr. Will Smith.

>> Good afternoon. Madam Vice Mayor how are you? Good afternoon, council. I wanted to first of all thank you guys because this is definitely a win for City of San José. I wish Mayor Liccardo was here. Because I remember I think it was the last time I was here he was talking about getting cranes up and being like Seattle. Right now we're being more like Seattle so I want to thank each and every one of you nice because mayor Ed Nouri there, they're getting things done and booming in Seattle and with the help of the governor they're expecting $54 million for transportation and all that's going to be facilitated by a project labor agreement, that is a big thing for City of Seattle, things are rolling there. Mayor Liccardo is right, let's be like Seattle, let's make sure we get the best, ache sure they get paid properly and make sure they are local hire, people that make a wage in that area can afford to live in that area. Let's keep in the back of our heads being like Seattle because these people are getting lots of support from labor and people in general this and I want to make sure the City of San José is behind each and every one of you guys. Keep this in mind, be like Seattle, keep things rolling, thighs laborers and developers can agree and everybody can live harmoniously in the City of San José. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you sir those are all the cards that I have on this item. I will turn to our council. I have Mr. Jimmy Khamis. Oh you don't?

>> Councilmember Khamis: Maybe I had the button pressed before. Thank you staff and thank you for investing in our city, appreciate your efforts and good luck to you. I hope that our
-- I hope that we don't run into any more unforeseen complexities. I hope those decrease significantly. Good luck to you, thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Councilmember Peralez, was that you?

>> Councilmember Peralez: That was my button that was pressed. Johnny tried to steal my thunder.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Trying to steal the show.

>> Councilmember Peralez: I'll be brief. Very, very excited for what we have in front of us. From the moment that Dennis brought the project forward, three years ago now, and presented it, I told him how impressed I was with what he was bringing forward. Certainly he knew the challenge that he had ahead of him. It has not been easy, and I think in the last meeting really when we set up for this date, couple of weeks ago when we set up for this DDA puts some kind of final goals in front of him to really be able to live up to and I myself was not pleased with some of the interaction he beforehand and Dennis thank you very much. You did that. You went out and engaged with the community. And with our labor representatives. And you built rapport. You were able to come to an agreement and I know it was not easy. But the project is still a tremendous project. We are ripe for growth and you came in at a time where you saw this coming and with the announcements and developments we see ahead of it not only that but certainly the encouragement from all of our labor representatives that has stayed on top of us as a full council to ensure that as we are developing and we know that we have a lot more development to come, that we are creating good jobs, good paying jobs, and that we are trying to hire our local workforce and you're staying on top of that. Couldn't be more excited for this project moving forward. Look forward Dennis to helping you out through next phase. Because I know we still have some hurdles ahead of us. I enthusiastically support the memo that I co-signed with my colleagues.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Was that a motion?

>> Councilmember Peralez: Yes.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Second?
Second.

Councilmember Carrasco: Any other speakers? Thank you so much, and I just want to echo what Councilmember Peralez and Khamis just mentioned. I want to thank everybody for coming out and voicing their concerns and their support from day 1. I especially want to thank Dennis. Thank you for bringing your project to our beautiful city and creating really a spectacular addition to our landscape. As you were showing the museum, we are reminded of some of the really iconic buildings we have and the tech museum is one of them. So having your project adjacent and connected to our museum really will highlight what San José is all about which is innovation and beauty and will bring, I think, folks into our core to really enjoy some spectacular moments, I hope. And have some really wonderful experiences. And as you know, as we said in my office, my children have had memorable moments in the hall there during their science competitions. They didn't win. But they had -- they learned a great deal about science. And so it's an important place for our children. And they're part of San José. And so they will continue to be part of San José. But I want to thank you for really coming to the table with Josue Garcia and with others to really work out many of those details that were so important to our men and women, and making sure that those challenges were met with grace and dignity. And that our men and women will be working on this beautiful project and that the residents will feel proud when they go downtown. Not that they will shop there and be entertained and live there and work there but that they will be able to look up around show their children what they built. And so I thank you for all that all of you have been able to do as this project moves forward. Your voices are heard here loud and clear in the four buildings of our chamber. And thank you staff for your presentation and for really sticking with us and making sure that the council will is also carried out. I know this is a long process but a worthwhile process and like everything, it is challenging and always worthwhile. So with that, oh, the council wants to continue to be heard. Councilmember Rocha.

Councilmember Rocha: Thank you, I missed the opportunity to make a comment. I have a question for the applicant Dennis Randall if you have a moment please. And if I reply, I layered the motion was made but did it include the suggestions or recommendations that the mayor left with?
>> Councilmember Peralez:  It did not. I think only one I recall hearing is that it could be in an info memo format from the staff. I didn't hear the other one.

>> Councilmember Rocha:  Item specific from 9, don't know? I thought you might have talked to him previously. Since you were on the memo together I assumed you had some insight.

>> Councilmember Peralez:  He's not here, I know he mentioned that in regards to a memo format from the update from staff, he mention they'd, I am comfortable with that. I don't recall if staff recalls what his other suggestion was.

>> Councilmember Rocha:  Mentioning the schedule of attachments, and it was days versus dates or dates versus days. I don't recall which --

>> He said actual dates for those, I can put those in. I do want to clarify his memo items 1 through 7 I viewed as an info memo back. Changes to the DDA, my view is you're approving the item subject to the developer agreeing. I provided an addendum which would reference all but 12 which is in the planning documents would be in a separate addendum to the DDA. What you're approving is the addendum unit to the developer agreeing to those items.

>> Councilmember Rocha:  I guess that leads me to my next item, thank you. Hope you attend more meetings. I like how you see half of a memo as an info memo. That would then slide that to the top items if I'm reading this correctly.

>> We've read the memo, we've looked at it in the context of the existing DDA and the memo as written in the context of the DDA, the meaning of the DDA is acceptable, yes.

>> Councilmember Rocha:  So number 9 gets moved to the top if I heard you correct Mr. Murtha?

>> I included it as a change. It adds something to the schedule. And so since it was adding something to our schedule of performance I just included it in my addendum. Which I have not run by the developer or his attorney yet either.

>> Councilmember Rocha:  This is the first he's heard of it.
My attorney felt the same all of the items in view of the DDA were acceptable. In terms of how they're interpreted we would be happy to modify the DDA in its context.

Councilmember Rocha: It's not often that folks from the development community, don't want a blanket generalization, incorporating as much of the public input and the council input that comes forward. You've done an excellent job, thank you very much. I thank development community and the members of the community showing up, it's great when we have this much support in the room at once.

Happy to do it. Thank you.

Councilmember Carrasco: Councilmember Arenas.

Councilmember Arenas: Actually I wanted to do exactly what Councilmember Rocha did at the end and it's really to thank Dennis for your willingness to be open and taking in all our feedback, as well as the feedback of everybody involved including the tech, the trades, and Eric, or the coming on board and helping support that. I also wanted us to -- if you look back there is a sea of orange and green, part of the trades that have made their way here today. I wants you to see that there is a lot of support there these folks who might possibly work on your project and they've made time to be here even though the agreement has already been worked out. So I wanted to thank them for their time for coming here. Because I know it's time away from your work. Time away from your family so thank you so much for continuing to be part of that process. And for staff, for working on this. There was the extent of my comments.

Thank you, Councilmember Arenas. Councilmember Peralez.

Councilmember Peralez: Just to clarify the motion as Councilmember Rocha pointed out. Sounds like staff understood it but the two recommendations from the mayor, info memo which you've already said that that's how you'll report back. And then the dates versus days. This is clarifying the motion if that's okay with the maker.
>> Councilmember Carrasco: We have a clarified motion and a second. And you clarified the second, seconder? Thank you. Just want to make sure. Okay any other comments from my council colleagues? Thank you so much.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Councilmember Davis, really nothing to offer? All right.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: I'm so glad it's you and not me. It was a tough year. Thank you so very much and we will take up that vote.

>> The Clerk: For the record, Vice Mayor Carrasco’s vote will show up as Mayor Liccardo.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: I like that! And that passes unanimously. [applause]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you all for coming. Really wish I could use the mallet. We will in a second. Why? Let's take a break. Let's do it after. Just once. So it's 4.1 and 4.2. We will be -- use your gavel.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: I can use my gavel? [Gavel]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Here we go. [Gavel]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: I'm sorry, I just wanted to do that. I don't mean to be rude. We will be taking up 4.1 and 4.2 at 4:00. Because that's what our public wanted to do. And we're happy to accommodate. But that means that between now and 4:00 we will be taking a brief recess. So -- so please come back after the tiny recess at 4:00 and 4.1 and 4.2 will be first on our agenda. Thank you. [recess]

>> Who is our division manager acting under the homeless team and then I'm also joined by Shasta Green from the city attorney's office. So we're going to go through a brief presentation. We wanted to give you an overview of the work that we've been doing and why we have been doing this work and obviously ended with the discussion on AB 2176. So we're going to be doing one presentation that will cover both topics. So first of all in terms of context there are approximately 4350 unhoused individuals in San José on any given night and tower% of the homeless rids were unsheltered living on the street it can be in an encampment, are car or RV.
97% of the respondents said yes when asked if they would accept an affordable home. It is a myth to say they want to live on the streets. Why should we worry about this issue? It's very expensive to keep people on the streets, in 2015, found that the county spent an average of $520 million annually from 2007 and 2012, for a total of more than $3 billion on basic services for homeless. Economic round table analyzed six years of data on more than 104,000 homeless people and found that the most persistently homeless person cost the city $62,000 a year but if housing is provided the figure drops to approximately $20,000 a year which is a 68% decline. The reduction in cost is related to a drop in emergency room visits, justice system encounters and drug and alcohol treatment. What is important to note is these costs do not include the cost of what it takes us in the City of San José to address this issue. Since the housing department took over the abatement program we wanted to focus on the three different approaches or rational reasons why it's important to address homelessness in our community. What we know is that homelessness impacts our neighborhoods, impacts our environment and the people who are actually homeless themselves. So since we implemented our homeless hot line in October, of last year, we’ve received over 3700 calls from our residents and business owners, asking for assistance because of a homeless encampment that has been impacting their quality of life and sometimes they’re just concerned about a person’s safety or health.. So the reality is unhoused individuals are already in our community and they inhabit our neighborhoods. We have removed 750,000 pounds ever trash, ending up in our streets and creeks. More importantly, 132 people died on the street last year. A recently released report from the Santa Clara County medical examiner’s office revealed that the number of homeless deaths in Santa Clara County increased 164% from 2011 to 2016. As I said last year, 132 people died on the street. Homeless Life span of 42 to 56 compared to 78 for the general population. So it’s dangerous to be homeless. So what has the housing department been doing in terms of a response to homelessness? We’ve focused on three solutions. Consistent destination home’s commitment to end homelessness. Three strategies include homeless prevention where we’re investing $750,000 for homeless services that will benefit 150 families, and we’re doing this with project home, where they’ve raised with this investment, $1.5 million. Rapid rehousing where the city invests 4.6 million in services and subsidies for 200 households. This program offers short term rental subsidies and targeted services and once a person graduates from the program we accept a new person into it. Lastly what we’ve talked a lot about is permanent supportive housing but as can you see it’s one of three tools. And permanent supportive housing is actually building housing that has wrap around services and I’m happy to say we have 582 apartments that we have funded and
we'll start construction this year. This type of housing provides extensive case management support and services. We've also been challenged by you the council to come up with interim solutions. You said these other three just aren't enough because people are suffering every take. And what could we do to alleviate that suffering? We have implemented four different programs. One is for the first time in two years we've opened four warming centers. We've also started providing outreach services, casa de Novo and the plaza hotel, and finally, this month we completed the new assembly youth health oranges. What have we done -- health ordinance. The safer parking program we have released two RFPs in attempt to provide a operator and places to implement the program but we weren't successful in implementing either one. What we discovered is that we have to draft a new ordinance. We have a draft outline for a new ordinance but we need more work and time and community outreach. This work impacts not only the housing department but also PBCE and the city attorney's office. Because we are working with initiatives both the PBCE and the city attorney's office we are asking this item be considered during the next council priority session. The last item you've asked us to come with you today is to talk about sanctioned encampments. We continue to monitor the sanction encampment movement. There are numerous regulatory constraints that have liability concerns in addition to the safety and quality of life issues. These issues were outlined buy memo from the city attorney's office and it includes the special occupancy parks act, landlord tenant law and CEQA. We have also learned from the Oakland persons where the compassionate community encampment was established. The City of Oakland provided camp and toilets. The city did not have a coordinated response to address the needs of the residents and they were unable to manage the number of people living on the site. And finally, two recent fires caused the city to close the encampment down. They have six sanctioned encampments. They were the first city to offer public land and funding to provide permitted encampments in the city. The sites are located in industrial and commercial areas. In June of this year they released a study on three encampments. Two of them are tent encampments and one is what they call a tiny home communities. There are several key findings that we thought were interesting. One is the model was successful, in serving people this live outside. They were able to attract people into the communities. Overall, the neighborhood responded positively the land was no significant increase in crime. Third they used a self governance model with case management and services. And finally they observed that the tiny home community provided more positive outcomes. This gets us into AB 2176. So when we last talks about encampments the housing department did not recommend moving forward and we said there was another alternative because a bill had been introduced by Nora Campos which
is AB 2176. I'm happy to say that it was passed and it became effective January 1st of this year. It is a five-year pilot program that would end in 2022, in order to implement it, we have to declare a shelter crisis, we have to adopt local codes. But I think what makes this so much more different, or I think which would guarantee a better outcome, is that in order for us to place anyone into an AB 2176 home, they have to have an exit plan. And what that means is, they either have to have a rapid rehousing certificate, which we would provide, and we would be looking for a place for them to live, or they have to be eligible for the five different permanent supportive housing districts we have in the pipeline. Without that they would not be eligible to move into the site. For first time this year the housing department conducted a study of the number of temporary and interim housing and the number of permanently available housing in San José that was targeted towards serving the homeless. While we have a tremendous history and record of building affordable rental apartments in the state we've produced over 18,000 affordable apartment rentals, only 888 units are set aside for homeless individuals and families. And only 415 of these are permanent, with no time limitation. By building the over 500 that are in our pipeline, we will are more than doubling our capacity when we complete the construction on these projects. If you look at the slide you'll note that council district 3 has the largest number of temporary housing and they come in second to permanent housing options. While council district 6 has the largest number of permanent housing with 104 apartments. But if you look at the remainder council districts, seven of them have less than a dozen units in one of the categories. So we have a lot of work to be done here. And part of that is because we didn't have the partnerships in the past that we have now. Which is the county and the housing authority. Which has allowed us to move forward. And certainly, with measure A we have lots of opportunities to change these numbers. So when we took this forward last year, one of the things that was really important was that the council districts agreed that each council district should play a role in providing bridge housing. The commitment was made with the previous council and today we are before you asking that you renew this commitment and to assist us in locating suitable sites in your districts. In order to be eligible the site has to either be vacant land or have a building that is underutilized or vacant. 10,000 square feet if it's a building, and close to transit and able to access utilities. In terms of the selection process and what we've done so far, per your direction, we were -- we decided to partner with the neighborhood commission to help us to start community engagement. And I have to say, we did get off to a slow start because of the Coyote creek flood response. However, since April we have released the sites in order to obtain initial feedback. So sometimes we get criticized for going out too quickly with site plans and designs.
And this time we're being criticized for going out not well enough prepared. And our original focus was going to be really having smaller meetings with neighborhood liter's, who are going to provide us early feedback, before we started working on any plans or picking any sites. But we did want to receive feedback because we knew there was a risk in siting near residential. A majority of these unconventional structures are located in commercial and industrial sites. So we presented to the neighborhood commission. We asked them for their help to give us seasonal preliminary information about these sites. And to talk to us about what was important to them regarding the concept, the operation, and how we could conduct a more effective neighborhood engagement program. Well, we received quite a bit of community feedback. The neighborhood commission meetings which we were invited to, I think it's very important to note, the housing department has not hosted one meeting yet on AB 2176. All of the other meetings that we've moved forward with were hosted by members of the neighborhood commission who invited us to their meetings. And the feedback was regarding level of services that we could bring forward. However, the word got out into the, primary into the city. And so we received three different online petitions, of which we've received over 5,000 signatures mostly saying they support rejecting any of the city owned sites that were in their neighborhoods. So D 2 said don't bring crime, drugs and disturbance to our hood. And there were 1730 signatures there. D 4 said, no to the shelter, 1339 signatures and D 9 said, no many shelters in many resident oaks pep the neighborhood survey which resulted -- [applause] So the resident reaction which came from the sites located in their neighborhood most of the feedback was about proximity to residential parks and schools. There was a lot of feedback about the quality of the structures and I think here is where it was unfortunate because we didn't have samples or drawings of what these structures would look like. And so it really left it up to the imagination of people of what we were considering. And the community also expressed concerns about safety. Not just safety of the residents that are actually going to be living on the site. But safety because the residents, the homeless residents would attract the belief was more homeless people into their neighborhoods and lastly people are concerned about how these communities would impact their property values. As a result of these meetings, the housing department responded with additional criteria. The criteria that I think is most important to consider especially if you are asking us to go back and to look is how close should we site these near residential. Again I've already said there is not any other community or again the majority of these are sited in commercial and retention. The would bold step is to put these into residential neighborhoods. We are asking people to live in houses or these tiny structures and we believe in integration and we did not want homeless people to be isolated.
So considering the settle back, that was consistent with the new church shelter ordinance. And that's how we got that set back. We also in response to the neighborhood recommended a 150 foot buffer with schools and activated public parks and 100 foot set back from major creeks and their tributary. We are going to be required to go through an environmental review so we thought it was consistent with that, to consider that last criteria. So what are our next steps? Our next steps is, we will be coming back to you with two actions. One is the completed designs. And because those are being donated to us, we are going to ask you to accept those designs on our behalf. We also have a developer and operator contract award that we would like you to accept as well. This would allow us to work on the operations, to finalize a budget, and to start designing site plans. And we anticipate that we would be able to come back in the fall with these two council actions. We also need to continue to work on site identification. Staff is not recommending any site today so I want to be absolutely clear. We're not recommending any sites. We went to the obvious when we started this work because the law requires that we either own to the sites or release the sites. So when we did our initial search we thought it made most sense to look at the sites that the city currently owned. We looked initially at 99, narrowed it to 13 and then narrowed it to three. But again, we are not recommending no sites to you today. We agree that we need to continue to work with public entities, like the water district and other entities, we need your help to reach out to those entities and we've done that and I don't have a list from either one of them yet. And then lastly the law allows us to use other structures. We believe hotels have been a successful model and commercial buildings which would be similar to the model that San Francisco uses through their navigation centers. We are recommending a public outreach plan and the public outreach plan we would recommend is to start doing some general community outreach on the program, five public meetings, four of them throughout the districts, one at City Hall, and we would not propose to do those until we have the site designs and we have the operator and developer on board. Because it's clear that without the specific information that people's imaginations on what we're proposing are all over the map. And I don't think it's fair to the residents and I don't think it's fair to our homeless residents for people to be just imagining what the communities will look like so I think we should have specifics. We would begin those once we have the specifics. Once we have sites identified that we believe would be viable is we would do targeted outreach to the surrounding neighborhoods and businesses. The final steps are to complete an environmental review. We would have to come back to council for you to declare the shelter crisis, for you to adopt the local building safety and health standards and for you to approve the site selection. So what I would like to end my presentation with is
an actual success story. And why? Because it's important to note that the people we're talking about each have their own individual stories. This is Leonard's story. After getting a divorce he lost his job and his car and ended up homeless as a result of a drug addiction. He ended up in the jungle for five years. The ending of the jungle ended up in his joining the downtown streets team. He worked with the case manager to get housed in the rapid rehousing program and through that program he was able to find a job. More importantly he was able to stop doing drugs. Leonard successfully graduated from the program and he gained a section 8 voucher with the help of his case manager. Today Leonard maintains his job and is thriving in stable housing. He remains grateful and thankful for outreach workers who found him in the jungle. Last year Leonard was interviewed by KQED radio. This is his quote, for grace of God these people came around and found a lot of us. It's great to have my own job and security. It feels like I'm on top of the world. Again, everyone has their story. We have a collective vision as a partner in destination home. And that vision is, no one should have to live outside. And with that I'm done with my presentation.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Okay, thank you, thank you, Jacky. We have quite a number of folks that are interested in speaking. And the cards keep coming in. And with no further ado, before I turn to council, I know that council also has quite a number of memos, that have been submitted. I know that the mayor is quite eager to get back here, and also, listen to our audience. But I'm going to get started on our audience feedback. We're going to actually have to limit it to one minute. But I know that there's many, many folks that want to speak. So I know that you all will be patient with us. Please start making your way down to the microphone. Please let's start with Christine Fitzgerald. Jennifer Roberts and Ms. Pamela Pitts. I have Christine Fitzgerald, Jennifer Roberts and Pamela Pitts. If you can make your way to the microphone please. And wire going to try and keep -- we're going to try to keep this moving. There is a lot of folks.

>> Good afternoon, madam Vice Mayor and city council members. My name is Jennifer Roberts, I'm a Thousand Oaks resident and district 9 resident as well. I'm here today to urge you to please support and accept the housing department's new site criteria. I also would urge you to please support and sell councilmembers Jimenez, Davis and Khamis, I apologize if I mispronounce your names, memoranda that accept the housing department staff report but also eliminates all city owned sites for the bridge housing community's project. The councilmembers suggest commercial and industrial properties away from residential areas for
bridge housing communities. I support this and think this is a great idea. Instead of the city having to spend a ton of money developing infrastructure on variant land, many vacant and underutilized commercial and industrial properties already have infrastructure in place including restrooms, kitchen facilities and also may even have heating and air conditioning service. I think one pilot program on commercial or industrial sites is a great idea. I also ask that you please involve the community in the bridge community process. Residents of the city are innovative, creative and highly intelligent. I believe our ideas can be very valuable in creating solutions for our homeless housing problem. In summary, please accept the housing department's new criteria, please consider councilmembers Jimenez, Davis and Khamis consideration, most importantly please allow the community to be part of the solution. Thank you very much. [applause]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Christine Fitzgerald and Pamela pitts.

>> I'm Pamela pitts and thank you for allowing me to voice my opinion today. I was informed they were putting a homeless village over in my area and I wanted to know what kind of protection our community would have with the possibility of increased crime what about using the fairgrounds instead. Because it's close to police, medical, and mental facilities, and I don't know -- our area's family-oriented. So I'm worried about having the increased crime and drug abuse. That's it.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you. [applause] Christine Fitzgerald, Marci Khan, Julie, if you could make your way town, as well as David Gutridge and Bob Gerillo. Thank you. Whoever makes it down to the mic first.

>> Hello. Having any community development that helps those in need are vitally important to the City's health and the community's sense of pride. Also, having these units built in such a way that everyone can fully participate, and take advantage of all the necessary infrastructure, transportation, working, playing, all of it. Has to be also geared for those with disabilities. It can't be for one if it's not for all.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you.
My name is Marci Khan, I live in the thousand oaks neighborhood. I have a lot to say but Jacky said a lot for me. There is a lot to consider about putting these types of communities near neighborhoods. All of us agree we have a huge homeless problem in San José, we need to address it. In my research I could not see any Oregon Washington or any other state a tiny residence commute located within a residential neighborhood. [applause]

So I would like to say I appreciate all of your efforts. I read all of your memoranda. I appreciate your efforts to look for other solutions. We’re happy to work with you to do that.

Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you Ms. Khan.

Councilmember Carrasco: If you could make your way town the stairs, thank you.

My name is David Guthridge. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Two points I would like to make. One is, no neighborhood should have to have a homeless shelter, installed in it, at the risk of their kids and our grand kids. I invite any of the councilmembers who wants to come, go to me to the Boccardo center on little orchard street which is a city-funded homeless shelter and see what the surrounding neighborhood looks like at night from 4:00 on, the people who are not accepted into the shelter but are drawn to the shelter, camp in the neighborhood. Now, it’s an industrial area. It’s where my office is. But this is what will happen if you put a shelter in a residential neighborhood. People -- [applause]

Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you sir. Your time is up. Thank you so much. Your time is up sir. Yes. Everybody has a minute. Everybody has a minute. And I would ask that you hold your applause so that we can hear the speakers so that everybody can have their time.

My name is Bob Gemello, thank you, Vice Mayor Carrasco. And councilmembers. I'm actually not going to say too much, except for the fact that what Jennifer said and what Marci said and what Dave has said pretty much covers it for me. I would just hope that we would all work in the community to create homes for these people. Nobody should be on the streets. But it clearly has worked in industrial and commercial situations. And I think we should stick with that if that's what's working. Thank you.
Good afternoon, madam Vice Mayor and members of city council that we depend on to help with these projects in our city. We appreciate you. Thank you for the hard work you do and it doesn't go unrecognized.

My name is Julie Torlincasa. I'm a member of the Thousand Oaks neighborhoods. I have lived in Saratoga and San José for almost 60 years. I would just like to take a second, I can't find my glasses so I can't read what I had prepared. Sorry. But I just want to take a minute to say, I agree with Jacky Morales. She has said a lot of what I wanted to say as far as the homeless. I know personally and as a neighborhood. We want to help the homeless. We've been working together, collectively, to try to come up with creative and innovative plans to present to you. The one plan I have to present to you is the innovative model from the Bill Wilson Center downtown that does traditional housing and meets the needs of these homeless individuals and their families.

Hello. As I have spent the last year and a half reading and studying about best practices to establish traditional villages for homeless, I stand prepared to help work towards the successful outcome for AB 2176 bridge housing. The recent report by the medical examiner which Jacky mentioned concludes that homeless deaths have raised by 164%, in this county over the past five years. Is this a fact that we can ignore? Here in the heart of Silicon Valley where all things should be possible, this is a project that should succeed big time. If we begin
anew by establishing a working group including experts, some of whom have successfully created transitional villages elsewhere, we can improve the process which developing a comprehensive plan. Best practices indicates that sites should not be identified until the project is well defined.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much. And your name?

>> I'm Karen Gillette.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you Ms. Karen.

>> My name is Andrew Lanier representing casa de Clara, transitional housing program in district 3. I'd like to thank Councilmember Jimenez for his memo. He released and I think it's really important that as we look into building bridge home communities that we're really focused on doing this as a community. That we incorporate people that are experiencing homelessness, that we incorporate the neighbors that are living in the community, where these communities will be. And that we really make this a community effort. I think we have to look to different other projects that have engaged neighborhoods and have succeeded. This will affect other projects going forward that the community is really able to buy into whatever project we are pushing forward with. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much. I'm just going to call a few more people down. Ms. Aurelia Sanchez, dina Dyson. Kyle glasser, and Mr. Bruce Roberts. If you could start making your way down, please.

>> Hello, I'm Gary climber from district 2, close to the Brenneman location. Walking paths from the school, the list goes on and on. Trying to, starting to hear the voices in the people. We urge you to open up transparency and communication because in lieu of true and current misinformation, misinformation abounds. Listen to the voting people of San José and find location more appropriate. Consider commercial and industrial sites, life time building up their neighborhoods. Investigate the best financially viable options as alternatives to bridge housing not only within the boundaries of San José but include Santa Clara County and neighboring communities because homelessness is not just a San José problem. Thank you. [applause]
Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you. I'm going to urge you again to keep your applause down so that we can hear the rest of the members who are eager to be heard. Thank you.

Hello, my name is Aurelia Sanchez and I live in district 3. I'm here because there is a lot of BS going around in this room in the newspaper. A lot of people are advocating for commercial and industrial. Two weeks ago, Councilmember Davis vetoed 14 affordable housing in her area because of a loss of business tax. How much business tax is going to be lost if we convert commercial and industrial areas? Think about that. I live in a district where we have approved a lot of homeless housing. And a lot of affordable housing. So has district 7. Everybody needs to step up to the plate drink the Kool-Aid and you know all this talk about helping people, it ain't going to happen unless you accept responsibility. I live in a neighborhood, I have grandchildren. You know I love my neighborhood. And we have so much affordable housing. There is -- you know what they're people just like us. Think of all the wealthy bankers and rich people that should be in jail are not in jail. Think of Wells Fargo. Think of all of those people. So income does not make the person. It's morals. Thank you.

Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you, Ms. Sanchez. Dina Dyson, Kyle Glosser, Bruce Roberts. Please step up, anyone.

Bruce Roberts. The success of the interfaith collaborative have demonstrated that real assistance can be given by communities working together without government interference. Just because you members of the council had the foresight to get out of the way so members of a collaborative could fulfill their mission. That is spirit of our country. Every unhoused person was housed at one time. In bad times we are neighbors. Just not now. Waving the magic wand won't work, sorry folks, housing will not vanish. Being think of all the money wasted by the sweeps. That's your money. I urge the council to let us continue building on what the collaborative has and can do. Support interim housing.

Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you.

Hi, I'm Dina Dyson from district 2, I live at Monterey and Bernal avenue. 300 families. My husband has been in the air national guard for 30 years, he works two jobs, we work extremely hard to live in San José, and raise our child in a mobile home park. It looks like they're breaking ground there at the intersection, I want to beseech the people here that I don't think
Monterey and Bernal is a suitable spot for this tiny village, tiny homeless village. Literally you could walk from that intersection to five minutes to where the 500 in the mobile home park and the Monterey grove park where the kids get dropped off by the bus, there is a bar hide away lounge there are already shenanigans at the hide away lodge. There whereas an opening of a mental health hospital, the San José behavioral health center. On Monterey road.

Nevertheless panhandling has increased already at that intersection and that gas station so I would consider a different location.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you Ms. Dyson. [applause]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: If Ms. Dorina Garcia Ingrid Grenados, Scott Knies, Caroline Osaturo and Gail Osmer.

>> My name is Kyle, I live in district 9. I just want to say the concerned citizens are not wrong to question the burden being unfairly shared among the area. I don't know why there's not a county or Bay Area wide or California wide initiative to take, tackle all these problems. I don't see the citizens of Atherton to be asked to, see if google, Apple all those companies that are minting money and they're not helping out to ask them to help out if they want to come here.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you sir.

>> Hello, my name is Ingrid Grenados, I'm a part of a nonprofit in East San José. I'm the father of three I have a daughter at U.C. Irvine a son at San José city college, my wife and I found ourselves to be unexpectedly leaving our home. My daughter had to hear from me the she would need to stay with friends while her mother and myself would be sleeping in the car. I never thought this would be my life. I just need a little bit of help to get back often our feet. We were able to secure housing for this family but I point out, his story is one we hear on a daily basis. We need to be one community and we need to support the housing task force. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you Ingrid. [applause]

>> Good afternoon, my name is Gail Osmer and I would like to thank Councilmember Peralez for your memo dated 8-29, update on homeless response initiative. In that memo, your office
is coordinating a meeting regarding the houseless with destination home and the housing department. What I find very interesting, and I didn't see in your memo, that the groups that are most affected by this are the homeless themselves. So I would recommend not to support the recommendation number 2, unless the houseless themselves sits on this group this task force. It is a homeless task force and the homeless need to be sitting on that task force. Thank you so much. [applause]

>> Hi, good afternoon, Vice Mayor Carrasco and councilmembers. My name is Carol Masatoro, I've been a district 2 constituent for 20 years. I have two points to make, site selection, in the housing director 8-18 memo, now three potential sites, shows 25 sites that are too small to be a bridge housing community site. Question, why are these sites on the spreadsheet to begin with, to take up space? Didn't staff have minimum qualifications for size prior to field investigation, yes they did as a matter of fact they quoted it, vacant or minimally developed paving only site of at least half an acre. They had 25 sites on a spreadsheet that aren't even valid right off the bat. Secondly cost. At any time the city put the cart before the horse? Wasn't a feasibility study done before this, 1.5 million sounds like a lot of money and coming out of my pocket. Sergio's point, council shall make a recommendation as to whether the benefits of a temporary housing facility pilot program outweigh the cost of the resources and staff time needed to implement it and if necessary redirect to other projects.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much. Thank you ma'am your time is up. Thank you. I'm going to call down Linda Locke, Steve Yotes, Diane who lives on sun crest. And Sue Holloway.

>> Good afternoon, Vice Mayor Carrasco. Members of the city council, Scott Knies, executive director of knowledge downtown association. We know that the ultimate solution for homeless is to provide housing, easier said than done. It takes a while obviously to site it, to fund it. We did pass measure A. We're going to have to get the bonding out there and it's going to be some years before we have these homes. That's why I think it's so critical to look at some of the interim solutions that Councilmember Peralez put forward in his memo. Specifically this idea of an integrated approach with our resources at the city, with behavioral health and the resources in the county, with the homeless community, with law enforcement, I mean it's going to take a village to take care of some of the issues that we have in the interim, until we can
create this housing. We can't do it just in downtown. District 3. We've got to embrace the other nine council districts too and that's going to take a little bit of time. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you, sir.

>> Hello my name is Linda locke I'm president of the Berryessa citizens' advisory council in district 4. Resident for over 50 years. We are concerned, we had a huge meeting on August the 17th, people came out in droves by the hundreds and it was word of mouth and they heard all kinds of strange and unusual things that are going to happen. It was good in a way because we got a lot of information out to them but it was kind of sad because people were upset to come in in the first place. These were concerned people, I had not seen them before in my life all of that time living the. They are concerned and want to do something. The confusion starts when we don't have a good plan, we didn't know how the information was supposed to be out. I was on the neighborhood commission for almost six years even though it was supposed to be three years and we were not allowed to be involved with the homeless. We were told that was not part of our job. It's kind of funny how things change. I was concerned that at our meetings in August everything was off the table. There was nothing going on it would be decided tonight at this meeting.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you.

>> That's it, thank you for your time.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: It goes by really fast.

>> Hi, I am Diane brickeen. I'm in district 4 in the Berryessa area. I think we're all here because we care. The homeless situation is a dire one. And we need to have a solution. However, unintended consequences come without a comprehensive plan. And what we have here is people who are in an uproar because there have not been enough community involvement. There has been a plan that has been top down. I would recommend that there be a commission, a homeless commission, service providers to discuss the different options. Also broaden why are we dealing with this just as a city? We are in a South Bay area. We also have the county resources that we could pool our resources with. And then, the other thing is that families really have not been discussed in the tiny house option. And I'm a casa, I
work with a child in foster care who is now living in Hollister because there are no homes in the area. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much. Thank you.

>> My name is Steve Yodes, I'm a resident of districts 2. Unfortunately I want to make it clear that the mayor had more important things to do to not be in this room right now. I hope efforts to support different ideas are not construed to opposition to your cause in general. I want to thank councilmembers Davis Jimenez and Khamis. The idea that any residential lot would make the best location for this project just does not make sense. There are better locations to the jobs and services that the people living the would need. I support the needs to help but better location he to achieve that goal. I say this to you, the community response has been resounding. Your decision should be a very easy one. Otherwise if you refuse to represent us we will have a very easy decision, the next time we see your name on a ballot. Thank you. [cheering and applause]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much and thank you for the comments. I will allow the mayor to let us know where he is on his own. He is just in the other tower meeting with senator Kamala Harris and mayors from around the Bay Area. But it is not more important but it is to deal with this exact issue and also other issues that we're dealing with. But he'll be here shortly. I assure you.

>> My name is Sue Holloway and I live near --

>> Councilmember Carrasco: I'm sorry. I'm going to ask you to also be respectful to the speaker, your colleague and your peer who is also interested in being heard.

>> My name is Sue Holloway near a homeless encampment. I live a block and a half off of Monterey rode. I built my home new and the problem we've had within the last five years with cars being broken into, homes being broken into, and also my garbage being topped because they get in my garbage after I put it out on Tuesday nights and I can't get it picked up because they mix the garbage with the paper products. Homeless people need our attention. They are in dire need. I feel we should put them in commercial. Or industrial areas. I feel we need to research this. It's an insult to them to put them in a trailer, a pod, or a tent. They need to have
regular homes, apartments like we all live in. So they can are people who do and perform in our community as we taxpayers do. And one thing I've not heard at all is vetting of these people that you put in these communities. And I feel as a California taxpayer, you need to vet them and they need to get California --

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much, ma'am. [applause]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Bobby Paul, Alisa Dodd, Christina Sharvenberg and Ms. Rhoda wolf. If you could please make it down to the mic.

>> Hi, I'm aAlisa Dodd, I don't know where Don Rocha is, I'd like to thank Khamis, Jimenez and Davis for actually putting forth a plan that shows a different solution rather than just looking for what has been. The one thing we haven't brought up now is the bulk of these homeless people at least in our area are drug addicts, they do not want help. I'd like to know what the city is doing for drug force to help those people out. AB 2476, to help the veterans, I'd like the city to look at this and how it's impacting the people who are barely surviving to afford their own homes today. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you so much.

>> Good afternoon. My name is Christina Sharonburg. I have to be honest, I never thought we would be here, asking you not to put homeless pods in our neighborhood or my park. Two issues, is bridge housing a vinyl option? I haven't seen significant reports, especially in a city as expensive as San José, however I'll quote from Jacky. Director of housing. This is semantics, these are encampments. Ending homeless for people living if encampments that the formation of encampments does not represent the end to homelessness. Point 2, where do put these pods, it doesn't take a psychology expert a HUD expert or another city council members, has a potential for disaster in fact no other city has put them in a residential area.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you ma'am.

>> Let's lose the example of thousand oaks -- [applause]

>> Good evening, my name is Rhoda wolf scale. I put wolf down. I filled --
>> Councilmember Carrasco: What's the other name?

>> Wolf scale. Nobody has mentioned much about the mentally ill. I have a brother who is schizophrenic, has been on section 8 for probably seven years. Any time anybody from Santa Clara County mental health checks on him he does find. But they don't have social workers go out for outreach. He has brought homeless drug addicts into areas, we need to look at own from Santa Clara mental health, my brother has been homeless three or four times. Money needs to be put in to the mental health we have in this city and this state. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you. [applause]

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Stephen Strupe, Sonia Herrera, Tim Wolker and Tim kill. If you can make your way town please. And I'd like to remind you of the one-minute timer that we have going. Just to make sure that we give everybody the equal time.

>> All right my name is Tim walker, I'm a resident of thousand oaks. You may be wondering why all the thousand oaks people have been here, out of district 1, the site is in the middle of our residential neighborhood. I hold a graduate degree in sociology, that makes me a sociologist. You have zero community support in the thousand oaks neighborhood. Do you want to put a homeless encampment where it is not wanted within 25 feet of a park within a thousand feet of my home? I think it is a ridiculous proposal. I don't think there is any sociology basis for it. People will be ostracized from the neighborhood, it is a community I moved into, I moved there to escape downtown which is where we would except XP to find homeless people, where it's built into the neighborhoods. Not in the same neighborhood. If you want to put something in put it in Almaden expressway. Not in my house.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you sir. [applause]

>> Can hello, my name is Sonia Herrera and I live in downtown district 3. When I was 16 years old I was followed each day by a man in a white truck. His stalking only ceased after I crossed over into a neighborhood on the other side of the tracks. Two year ago I spent the night in the jungle ton night before its evacuation. My houseless hosts fed me in the rain. Experiences like this prove our feelings about nonhomeless people. We cannot let our
irrational fear of the poor dissuade us from providing needed shelter. Bridge housing can help San José alleviate homeless crisis and the safety net can allow us to build denser housing structures and increase the supply of housing in San José that's lowering the cost of housing in the long run. I support bridge housing and tiny homes including my district, district 3.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you. Steven.

>> Vice Mayor Carrasco, and city council, thank you for giving me moment to speak here. I live -- my name is Tim kale, and I little across the street from the only proposed are proposal in district 9. When I bought into that district many years ago and I never envisioned that. I feel some of my neighbors feel the same way. I think we need to do something, I don't know what that answer is, I don't know if anybody really truly knows what the true answer is. But throwing a homeless encampment in a residential area including my own is not acceptable. I'm here to support Jacky Morales's updated memorandum, that moves the homeless encampment 150 feet from homes and parks. Thank you for your time and please respectfully listen to a lot of the people that have spoken today, I think there's an idea out there that can help everybody. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you sir. Stephen Strobe, mark riser. Laura Moksayaski, I'm sorry if I'm butchering your name, I apologize. Pilar, another David, David Moksayaski, again I'm so sorry. Jane Iverson. If you can make your way down. Your name please.

>> Good afternoon, Vice Mayor Carrasco, members of the city council, Pilar, on batch of our members I'm here to voice my support for the memo authored for Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Carrasco and councilmembers. Earlier the council agreed it was importantly and fair to find potential sites within each council district. You must stand firm on this commitment. You must reject and take ostand against NIMBYism. We are all San José, we are young and old, rich and poor, louse and voiceless, housed and homeless. We know the economic and environmental and health consequences, we have gorgeous weather right now but soon it will be rainy and cold. We are count being on all of you to do what's right today to ensure that more people are sheltered in the future. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Carrasco: Thank you.
Mayor Liccardo: Go ahead.

Many District 2 resident and homeowner, Hayes neighborhood. I'm opposed to bridge housing located within communities, the number of people that might benefit with this plan as composed to overall homeless population is significant. A large part of retirement savings to ful people is the value of their home. The Seattle model has designated industrial and commercial sites for the tiny home not designated residential. Limiting impacts to neighbor being communities whereas locating within residential areas will most definitely have a detrimental effect on those surrounding communities in so many ways. There are a number of vacant buildings in industrial communities, which may seem appropriate in site selection. I urge you to modify the selection criteria accordingly.

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you sir. Mr. Stroop.

Mr. Mayor, Vice Mayor and councilmembers. My name is Mark Reese. I own a civil engineering firm in San José. Both plans are not feasible whatsoever. The Branham Monterey that could maybe house 60 homeless when I look at setbacks and ingress issues with it, it comes to maybe ten or 11. And or the Bernal site you are basically having homeless houses on an interchange ramp. So carcinogens, ingress issues, children playing on actually Monterey highway it's just not a safe area. Please just get a plan together. Make it humane for homeless and I think that's our best of plan.

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you sir.

I have it on a plan that shows it doesn't work.

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you sir. Hi Laura.

Laura Montinski. There is nothing compassionate about sticking someone in an emergency sleeping cab nine a residential neighborhood far from services to address the underlying causes of homelessness. Homelessness is not the lack of a roof, not the lack of a solution, out of sight out of mind does not solve this huge problem plaguing society. People with pledge illness need full time mental health services, people with addiction problems need full time
services and those in different situations can have a full time volunteer positions, pick up litter, removing graffiti in exchange for housing. There are not residents in residential areas to deal with these issues. Is this typy gesture really worth all the time energy resources and anger? I urge you to vote no to where there are not full time services to help people rise above homelessness.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you. After -- I'm sorry. After Ms. Iverson is Stephen Stroop, Diane Florida Castello, Marie Arnold, forgive me if I'm not reading it correctly, Sergei on basking ridge and Tessa.

>> My name is Jane Iverson and I live right in the neighborhood at Monterey and Branham. First of all the spots chosen seems like a knee jerk reaction to the homeless issue. I saw an article on the news that shows homeless housing for women and children. They have a six month waiting list. We are putting up basically shacks, second of all there are hawks, federally protected birds of prey that have lived there for over 20 years. It took me hours to finally get the Audubon society, so they can have a biologist get out there to check for a nest. They are protective nests as well. Finally we had a back door weed abatement from Mr. Khamis's office, they went through Department of Transportation to get this done. They didn't do any kind of research on what was living there.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you very much ma'am. Welcome. [applause]

>> Good afternoon, my name is Diana Castello, I'm with the law foundation of Silicon Valley, I want to thank members, staff, and members of the public for their work on this issue. We serve a wide range of San José residents including people living with physical and mental disabilities and young adults aging out of the foster care system. We support efforts to increase our supply of housing for homeless people including temporary housing. Bridge housing. So site selection criteria cannot be based on unreasonable fear and stereotypes about residents who live in BHC's. I wrote to you and I said the federal fair housing act prevents discrimination based on disability. I'm going to run out of time. I'm urging the council to support the mayor, Vice Mayor and other councilmembers memo. Thank you.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Welcome sir.
My name is Steve Stroop. I lived in San José since I got out of the army. I'm against putting these tiny units in our neighborhoods. No other city has done this. Portland has put them in downtown and business industrial area. San José is doing social engineering. I have attended meetings in district 9, 10 and 2. I live if district 10. A very diverse group of citizens do not want this bridge housing. This has nothing to do with national politics. The citizens do not want this expensive bridge housing in our neighborhoods. The county fairgrounds, the 160 acres out there is the ideal place. Others have had notions that this is not a good idea. Most of the citizens do not want it. We do live in a democracy don't we?

Mayor Liccardo: Welcome sir. [applause] [Gavel]

Mayor Liccardo: It's important for us to hear from everybody. I'm going to ask you to refrain from either booing or clapping. We'd like to hear from everyone.

Sergei Aragon. Today, along with taxpayers from Santa Clara spend half a billion dollars per year on various homeless problems. And I also know that most of this cost is due to some small percentage of permanent homeless. However I do not see how this bridge project addresses a particular group or the issues that are related to this like mental issues, crime, and so we have -- so I don't see how this is addressed this this proposal. We have two proposals one from the mayor and one from D 2 D 4 D 9 and mayor's proposal calls for experiment in ten places. While the D 2 D 4 and D 9 proposal is just for one place. Experiment I suggest we go for one place for beginning.

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you sir. Welcome Marie. After Marie is Tessa, followed by Sandy Perry, Kirdy Narayan, Marilyn Rogers and Shannon Robinson.

I'm Marie Arnold and I used to be a neighborhood commissioner for district 2 for eight years. And the best, I've been following this issue for as long as it's happening, and I could you know every time he opens his mouth Ray Bramson I could hear what he said you know. I felt like nothing was being done. At least something is being done so I'm for it. The best I attended, I believe I attended 15 of these items and one of them was at Branham high school that Don Rocha and others I think they were from the county. And as a Public Health nurse, you have to get the people who are sick need an address so that they can be followed up. The only time we see them is when they fall down and they wind up in the hospital. But we put
them in a cab, and send them back to where three come from. I live at Blossom Hill and Snell in blossom valley. And the day after the jungle was roused all of those people came and lived in our house at Blossom Hill and Snell.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you ma'am. Welcome Tessa.

>> I'm Tessa woodmancy in district 6. I'm for proposal. I live on the border by district 3, you're considering the area by Taylor and the Guadalupe highway there. The reason I see, a lot of times the people I don't see the homeless as injuring us because they don't pollute. My husband would refer to them as Medican monks, they are not injuring. I live next door to the gas leaf blowers and trimmers and mowers and all the noise and pollution from the neighbors and the pollution from the bussing he and the trucks the backup beepers and our capitalist society, we have so much more injuries. So in honor of the low injury and in honor of the Houston and the problems that we're having with climate change I would like to honor the homeless by saying we need to mitigate the problems in our community by creating good quality of life. By reducing traffic on our neighborhood. By.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you ma'am, thank you. Thank you very much. Welcome Marilyn.

>> Hi, I'm Marilyn Rogers, president of VEP, 2600 homes between Branham and Snell. I'm a nurse but also a community leader, I represent and concerned about what my neighbors are concerned about, that is we really need to kind of rewind a little bit and I'm here to strongly support Councilmember Khamis, Jimenez and Davis proposal that we initiate a short term task force, made up of every council district, representatives, I won't go into what's in the memo but please please I can't emphasize enough we need to get representation, all of you know me know I have a strong value around this. It is no surprise. Please do that. We've gone a long way, the housing department has done a good job, very good intentions, but we've got to get more input from our neighbors.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you ma'am.

>> We have the brains of the valley --

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you Marilyn. Welcome.
Good evening, my name is Shannon Robinson, I'm a project manager with downtown streets team, I'm here to support the bridge housing communities and the effort the City's put forward in making those a reality in our community. I do want to however strongly oppose the possible reduction of reducing the number of sites from 10 to 2 that is listed on 4.2 on today's agenda. Our unhoused community members they live in every single community in San José and it is our responsibility as a community to take care of everyone as a whole. We all know that we live in one of the most expensive cities in the entire country and this problem is not going to go away on its own and it takes an entire community to make a difference. Please continue this goal of inclusivity and stability, please don't take action by reducing the number of sites from ten to two. Thank you.

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you. Welcome.

My name is Kiefte and I represent district 4, we were the ones that had about 1600 supporters. I have four points, home not found was sponsored by destination home, one of the sponsors that would benefit from establishing a tiny home development. $520 million for 800 homeless people and talking about 20 to 50 people, that's a cost of 1 million one time and $500,000 per year, how is that economic use of the funds? Point number 3, Donner lofts, 153, for homeless emergencies in six months. How to you ensure that the quality of life is not affected for peaceful neighborhoods. I'm an engineer by profession and if we don't build software that's useful for our customers --

Mayor Liccardo: Thank you sir. Welcome Cindy. [applause]

Mayor Liccardo: After Sandi is Rodney mayer. Stephanie Ray and Shanie Klinehouse.

My name is Sandy Perry, from affordable housing network. We voted 2 to 1 in favor of measure A to tax ourselves to house the homeless. However we want to house the homeless intelligently effectively, collaboratively. And we want to house the homeless on a scale large enough to solve the problem. Affordable housing network supports the memos from Councilmember Jimenez, Councilmember Rocha and the one that Councilmember Peralez put out today. We do need a task force, or a working group of neighborhoods, homeless advocates, faith and communities volunteers, to address the issues of transitional housing.
We also support the sense of urgency that's in all the memos. But what we don't support is the status quo. We can't allow thousands of people to continue to languish in the streets of San José. Status quo is unacceptable. Thank you.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you.

>> My name is Mark Reeseer and I was a boxer in East San José and a machinist for three years. My sons went to San José State and all I want to do and to power your vote all you have to do is vote it down and I lose 25% of my home. I can't believe people do this to me, 30 years of working in dirty machine shops, I can't believe you would do this to our family. Put them at the fairgrounds, put them anywhere. Thank you for your time.

>> Mayor Liccardo: Thank you, yes, ma'am. Welcome.

>>> Good afternoon, mayor, councilmembers, staff. My name is Stephanie. I'm here to tell you that I strongly believe in immediate housing for homeless individuals. I am actually one myself, a former one thank goodness. But I do want to tell you that as a former homeless person I can tell you that we don't really care that much where the housing is. It could be industrial, it could be residential, it could be commercial. We just need it to be safe and dry basically at the end of the day. And also I highly recommend as close to transit, route 22 would probably be the best. So, thank you very much for considering this project. Very quickly, I know I'm running out of time. I also would highly recommend that the homeless people get involved in the building of the project. I think it would help them perhaps instead of giving them a fish, it would help them learn how to fish and maybe earn their way moving forward on their own. Thank you again very much for considering this.

>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Welcome.

>>> Rodney Meyer, district 2. We are very disappointed that district 2 has been singled out to house these homeless people in these encampments. We've had a tremendous upsurge in crime. We can't even go to the store and get a glass of milk or thing of milk without having an armed guard outside because of the people are exposing themselves. There are people
breaking in on Donner square. And we do not want more people to show up and more of this activities to happen. Our house got broken into. The police couldn't respond after over 30 minutes, they couldn't respond. Even though there was -- the individual was still inside. And so we're going to add more people to have more problems and create more issues. We need to put them in a place where they can get services and we have to make them understand that -- move forward, not put them in a residential neighborhood where they are going to affect our quality of life and what our businesses, our homes, and our families. Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Thank you. Welcome, Kris.

>>> My name is Chris block. The bad news is this is really tough. And the good news is we're in San José, and we have a long, long history in this city of taking really hard complex problems and solving them. And we will solve this problem as well. About a month ago I went to Seattle and I visited five of the six encampments, sanctioned encampments unannouncinged. I showed up so I could see what was hackly happening. There is good news in this model. And while I think we need to balance the residential nature of neighborhoods and where these encampments go, I will also tell you that most of the encampments I saw -- there is a difference between respecting the residential neighborhoods and isolating these encampments where people are one step removed from the larger community. And that will be the challenge with this proposal, is striking that balance. But again, most importantly, the good news is we're going to address this issue and we're going to solve it and it's going to make sense for both neighborhoods and homeless people. Thanks.

>> Thank you, Chris. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Welcome, Shannon. After ms. kevin Kline house is Joan estelle followed by Andre. Please forgive me if i mispronounced your last name on creek circle. Loony. Leslie Meyer. And Patty fish Berg.

>>> Good afternoon, mayor liccardo and councilmembers. My name is Shanique. I speak for Santa Clara audubon society. Our public process led to today's staff memo. We participated in meetings and together with the California native plan society, Green foothills, citizens complete refuge and keep coyote creek beautiful. We are sympathetic to the plight of the
homeless people in San José and we are glad San José is working so hard to address the issue. But in our letter we asked for bridge housing development not to be placed in our most sensitive environments, creek corridors, power plant and open space. We asked for a set back of at least 100 feet away from major creeks and tributaries. We asked for 300 feet near power plants owned by the city near the creeks because they are so important to our ecological system. We expressed concern on communities designated mitigation lands and habitat North of highway 237. So, in your --

>> Thank you.

>>> In your discussion today, please recognize those sites. Thank you.

>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Welcome. Come on up. We'll take you. There we go, thank you.

>>> My name is Sue Hobbs. I have and I'm in district 2. I haven't paid much attention to this issue until very recently, and I commend all these people that have really studied this. I'm just going to say that I don't think district 2 or any district in San José is going to be successful with this bridge housing and I blame it on the city. I called because there is garbage everywhere. There's shopping carts at Snell and Branham. I get bounced from one place to another. This city -- I even got a note from one of my friends back East because I'm from New England. San José is the pothole capital of the United States. This city does not complete anything it starts. And I frankly think that anybody that has -- any council man who has voted against any of these tiny homes in their cities or in their districts should not be allowed to vote when it comes time to vote for district 2 as to what we're going to get.

>> Thank you very much. [ APPLAUSE ]

>>> Good evening. My name is Joan Estelle and I'm from district 10. I'm a senior citizen along with my husband and several other members of our neighborhood who have lived there for 38 1/2 plus years. We feel that we've worked extremely hard for our housing. We are old, and we'd like to keep it nice, our neighborhood. We do believe that the homeless should be sheltered, but we don't believe that it should be in our neighborhood. Currently, we already
have several places in our neighborhood for the people that need it. We're sheltering battered women. Also, we have a shelter for Asian boys troubled, and we have the oak tree village low income housing. We feel that our neighborhood has done enough. That South San José is being targeted.

>> Thank you.

>>> Thank you.

>> Thank you, ma’am. [CHEERING AND APPLAUDING]

>> Welcome.

>>> Good evening, mayor and city council. My name is esach and I'm here to support Jimenez, Khamis and Davis’s memo. I think it makes sense. I think it makes sense to all work together as a community. But one thing I want to point out that I haven't heard tonight is the word homeless is used in such a loose term. We all know that we get frustrated with the mentally ill, the people that are addicts, those are the ones that are really frustrating. The people that really are homeless, we all want to help. Everyone here wants to help, okay. But there's other ways of doing it and I think it's taking the time and working with the for example, I'm involved with safe parking at our church where people can come after 7:00. We have security. We feed and breakfast, we give them a little snack and they go off to work. Those are the kind of programs that we need to experiment in and see what we can do. And I just really support the community.

>> Thank you, sir.

>>> It's already been a minute, huh?

>> It goes fast. Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Welcome.
Lessly buyer, district 2. Mr. liccardo, you visited us last year. Minor school. Do you remember you were outside? And the only thing you ever said it was that we had such high crime in the area. So, you had all the cameras and things and that is an the only thing, right? This is a very high-crime area. So, the best way to help a high-crime area is for people to own their home, you know. It takes you -- costs you a lot of money, you put a lot of work in it. So, to put people who are going to live in little tents is not helping the neighborhood, especially the neighborhood who you pointed out as being such high-crime area, I've lived there for 27 years. I've seen it go down and up and down, and I don't want it to go even farther down. We put too much money and effort into it. We are willing to help. A lot of people have said the same thing. But to pretend that everything will be okay and these people will be singing holy, you know, hymns is wrong. There are places you can put them. We can all help, but please be careful where you put them because as you see, people show up here, we can show up for voting, too. Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

Thank you very much. Welcome. Welcome.

My name is Andre from district 2. I live close to the site of branham and Monterey which is in district 10. First of all, I want to say that I believe that everybody in this room wants to help the homeless and help solve the issue of homelessness. We do care about them, and personally I am involved in helping the homeless, making sandwiches for them, gathering a lot of supplies. My church houses the homeless during the winter. So, it's not a question of should we do that, but how we do that. And I believe that it's not fair to put them in any residential area because wherever you put those tiny homes, the property values of the people living there will plummet. And I sympathize with the people who have worked hard all their life to buy into this dream of homeownership and it's not unfair to single just a few.

Thank you.

So, we all have to chip in -- [ inaudible ].

Thank you. Welcome. Patty? [ APPLAUSE ]

Hello, I'm Patty Fishburne, I'm in Sergio's district, district 2. I'm just going to read mine. The homeless situation needs to be viewed from the rooftop. There are so many dimensions to it. Drug addiction, mental illness, veterans with PTSD, job training, people working the system, criminal activity, et cetera. Nor a campus is looking through a peep hole for a solution. As you know, planning solutions requires many people, caseworkers, social workers, companies to train those who are willing. I.E., google. Please include some of the San José residents. My neighbors have a lot of good ideas. Pick their brains. So far, Sam, it's not working out. Please be flexible and open minded. I'm not real familiar with your gang prevention task force, but I think you should have gang bangers on the task force, too. Just like your mayor's task force on home --

Thank you. Thank you very much. [APPLAUSE]

Robert?

Mayor and councilmembers, thank you for what you've done, what you're doing. Thank you, housing department. They say where there is a will there is a way, and I imagine there's a lot of ways in this audience. I think that what we need to do is look at the situation as it truly is. I am homeless. I would like a place to live. Even if it's a tiny home. And there's many people on this dais right here that would have no problem whatsoever with me moving in next door to them. I think there's a large number of people that are out there that, like myself, are victims of what has happened to them and have not made a choice to be homeless. I'm homeless again after having lived in the jungle, found housing, and back out in the street again. Thank you to all of you that have written letters for me. It's an advantage that I have that many other people don't have. The people that are out there that are trying to make something of their lives, they're trying to get jobs or do whatever they want to do, go back to school, need a safe, sane place to be. And if that means being in a neighborhood where there's other people, then they should be welcomed because not every person that's homeless has got a problem. Not every person that's homeless is a threat to anyone else. Larry Stone has said that not once has the property values dropped as a result of a housing situation being brought into a neighborhood. In fact, it's been just the opposite.

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

Members of the city council, I strongly believe that the bridge housing communities as proposed by the city housing department in its current form which appears to be lacking in direction and clarity in terms of using our neighborhood as experiments in solving our complex homeless problem is not the right solution. I do not doubt the department's sincere intention to solve this pressing issue, however it does not address our neighborhood concerns. Our fears are not unfounded. The deputy city manager himself in a memo June 5, 2013, mentioned homeless encampments are often a haven for the criminal element. People who are avoiding law enforcement, engaging in prostitution, or people dealing and using drugs. There are also those people who have mental health issues or substance abuse issues which often draws a police response due to their behavioral outburst. One of the main concerns for these encampments is there are serious health and sanitation issues.

Thank you, sir. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

Welcome.

Good evening. My name is Martin porous. I'm a resident of district 2 and I'm here just to voice my concern about 2, about the bridging housing complex you guys are proposing. I don't think it's a well thought out plan. I don't believe that just giving houses to the homeless is going to fix everything for them. They have a lot of mental issues, a very complex problem. I don't think this is the solution. I'm also concerned about the stress that this would cause on the communities that you plan on implementing this and no one has talked about what support they are going to give the communities for all this housing that they're going to propose. The community already has a lot of issues to deal with, crime and there's not enough police support. I'm recently moved there a couple years ago and I purchased the home there, a very expensive home. I saved a lot of money. I have been working since I was ten, and I wanted to live in a nice community and I believe this will wreck that dream of mine. And I'm very concerned about it and I just wanted to let you guys know about it.

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

Good afternoon, mayor, councilmembers. Thank you very much for taking the time. Many of you have listened to the community which received responses, Jackie, many of you, district council 9, Donald. And I am a voter and I voted for measure a, ask 67.8% voted for measure A. Resulted in $950 million to help out homeless people. Yes, we do care about the plight of our homeless. 7,000 of them in the county. If we take $950 million and divide by 7,000, each of those 7,000 people would have $135,715. That is for one homeless person, $950 million. What can they do with that money? I think we have to be able to find a solution for them whereby we do not have to inflict pain and stress on our families in the last three months many of us lost sleep because we know that these homeless people, only 250 of them, is going to be in ten districts near neighborhood, parks, near residents.

Thank you, sir.

Near school.

Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

Thank you. Welcome.

Hi, I'd like to thank everybody here for being here tonight and listening to us. We really appreciate your time. I also would like to say that my name is Patsy Lyndsay. I live in district 9. The thousand Oklahoma City park area. I have some real concerns. Thousand oaks park area. I have some real concerns even before this proposal. I have taken my 5-year-old grandson to the park. I've seen dirty needles, used condoms, empty liquor bottles and empty beer cans. There are always problems over there shall not always, but recently more often than not. It doesn't feel safe. We also know that over 50% of our homeless have problems with addiction and mental health issues. Putting them across the street from a park where our children play does not make sense. It's your job and our job to keep our children and grandchildren safe. That's not how you do it. When I bought our house 30 years ago --
>> Thank you, ma’am.

>>> Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. [ APPLAUSE ]

>>> Hello, Eileen hunter, on route 22 in the women’s gathering place for homeless and at-risk women. In Texas we are seeing what happens when a city and its residents do not take action to solve its most difficult problems. 20 small homes, 20, can we have perspective in the room? Filled with our fellow residents, not criminals, vetted by our experts. Mental health -- mental illness can be depression, anxiety, ptsd and trauma, not just the most difficult cases. Create a homeless task force. Call it a collaboration. Make it diverse and inclusive. Stay on track for Evans lane. A model with a community garden and library. It would be an example that says, yes, San José can do what's right. A woman I deeply cared for died while living in her car. She was over 60 yet still hopeful for a future safe place to live. She was not a criminal. Her crime was poverty. Please, let's do the right thing in San José. [ APPLAUSE ]


>>> Hello, my name is Lisa and i live in district 3. I work assisting individuals experiencing homelessness and finding jobs and finding paths to self-sufficiency. I've had the privilege of working with that gentleman on screen. I'm here to say it irks me to hear some of the statements I'm hearing about the homeless in our community, claiming that all homeless individuals are drug addicts or don't want to change is not only ignorant, but it prevents us from actual progressive change in our community. More importantly, helping our most vulnerable to be a part of a community and have access to public transportation, libraries and food sources within a neighborhood. Sets individuals up for success rather than failure. We need innovation and we need all the inclusive options that we can get. This is why I fully support the bridge housing community and also urge the council not to reduce the number of sites from 10 to 2. Thank you.

>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]
Welcome.

Hi, my name is Ashley. I live in the Thousand Oaks neighborhood of district 9. I hope that the mayor and council members will listen to your constituents and your colleagues at the housing department and accept their amended criteria and plan. I know many people including some on the council have called our arguments nymbis. Frankly this experiment doesn't belong in anyone's backyard until the city has run a pilot to ensure this is a manageable, economical and effective solution that is positive and safe for both the Bhc residents and neighboring communities. I will want today bring up the environment in the fact these Bhcs are supposed to be temporary solutions yet by developing natural open space you will be permanently obliterating the environment which doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to me. Thank you.

Thank you. [CHEERING AND APPLAUDING]

Welcome. Are you Desmond?

I'm Desmond Careras.

Thank you.

As of three weeks ago my wife who is a school teacher here in San José, purchased our home in district 2. We should be a success story up there, working class people working to get a home here in one of the most expensive areas of the country. To have our new home considered that we're going to have homeless encampments, I was homeless in college. I lived in my car. I remember waking up with people next to my window going, who is that guy sleeping in the car? Did that deter me from moving forward? Now we're homeowners here. I don't want to see -- I don't want to raise my family around homeless encampments. I just don't. Everything that can be said has been said here. As for me and my family we want a safe community that we can raise our family.

Thank you. [CHEERING AND APPLAUDING]

Hi, good afternoon, everybody. Scott Largent. It's good to see success stories like this. I fell into the same situation, I was homeless. I own an electronics business here in Silicon Valley for about 24 years and I fell on some really, really hard times. I had a couple customers kind of all my eggs were in one basket. It all fell out from underneath me and I started living in a motor home, was getting bounced around from place to place, and it was rough. It was really rough. But the homeless people that were around me that embraced me were the people that held me up. All the people I grew up without of Saratoga, los gatos, they turned their backs on me. I'm a good person, okay. I am not disposable. You know, we fall on hard times and we have to lift people up that have it the hardest. I listen to this group. As far as I'm hearing, everybody right here wants to gas the homeless. It's disgusting. These people need to step up to the plate and find some solutions. Listen to all these people. These are the people probably throwing trash on my motor home, calling the cops for no reason. Despicable. You people are trash. [APPLAUSE]

Welcome. My name is Katrina Baker. I'm a youth pastor for three churches here in San José. I live on the corner of branham and Monterey. I want to share were you I have no issue with people residing in a residential neighborhood. I think the idea of bridge housing being located near a library is wonderful because that allows access to resources such as free Internet and computer use. I also have heard a lot of really great and wonderful creative ideas today which I applaud for people for thinking of I hope you the councilmember and mayor will think in addition to the ideas and not instead of. You have a lot of wonderful professionals who shared data and research with you I hope as you make your decision you will listen to their information and not just on based opinions and fears from other people. I would like to remind people the solution is temporary and people who would be staying there would be waiting for more permanent low income housing that we have not built yet and would not be finished for a long time. People are continuing to die on the streets and they need somewhere to stay that is safe right now. Thank you.

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]
Welcome, sir. Please also join us Larry Turner, Jamie full Berg. Kathy Mattingly. Jerry. And Phil.

Mr. mayor, Larry Turner. I'm not going to bore you with this speech. I'm not even going to tell you what everybody else has been saying tonight. I'm just going to tell you that good ideas people rally behind. Bad ideas, you get opposition like everybody here. So, I'm just going to say that not too many people are rallying behind this so it can't be a very good idea.

Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

Welcome. Please.

My name is Jamie. Thank you for your attention on this matter. I just want to tell you about my manic Monday. We started at court at 8:00 A.M. where people were being swept and we went there to give them water and help them. Their animals were distressed. From there we went to go move an rv where me and my co-founder and one other person, we had to pull from the street that was homeless, had to push an rv to a safe place so that the rv wouldn't be taken. This is an rv that was donated to little bit who was on the cover of the mercury news. The seniors are living outside and they really need help so we're there for them. After that we went to meet with a person who works for the school district who was reprimanded for using the shower. She needs a place to live and a place to shower and so we went to try to help her and see if we can help her home needs. From there we went to get ice cream for cory court people that were very stressed and we hung out with them for a little bit and from there we came home. It was like 10:00 at night and we witnessed a security guard here on City Hall grounds kicking a homeless person. And I got out of the car and i scolded him. Now I have the whole thing on video. So, our friends, they are very good people and they just need help. They need somewhere to live.

Thank you, ma'am.

One last this can --

Thank you. I'm sorry. Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]
Welcome.

Thank you, good afternoon, mayor Sam liccardo, councilmember. I have lived in San José 30 years. I have a home, have kids, so I can fully understand the concerns people have voiced here and I think I see that most people are on the side of more studies, more evaluation. However, I'm also an advance leader in the Catholic church and have worked with the homeless a number of years in many capacities, serving breakfast for the poor on Saturday mornings through envision. Also working with them through village house. And I think the biggest issue that San José can help to propose any solution is around dispelling the myths of homelessness, education, because 30% of our homeless are homeless or unsheltered because of job loss. 20% because of eviction. 15% because of domestic violence or abuse. There is a lot more that is part of our 4700 unsheltered people in San José than just drugs and alcohol. If people are more educated they'll be more compassionate. I believe we can find creative solutions but education is key. All of us are really one or two paychecks away from being in their shoes. Google, affordable housing. Thank you very much.

Thank you very much. [APPLAUSE]

Welcome. Kathy Mattingly, Phil. Diana tong. And mergesh. If you haven't been called, please fill out a yellow card and come on down.

Hi, my name is Kathy Mattingly. I represent myself because I'm a homeowner. I have teenage grandchildren living with me. I have homeless that I walk to every morning. My children in the neighborhood walk past. The people in the park are sleeping on the ground. How does it degrade my property values if I get those people in a supportive environment? [APPLAUSE]

I really believe all those concerns are valid, both the housed and the unhoused. I just want to tell you I'm on both sides. Yes, I'm a Catholic church representative and advocate and all that. But I'm your constituent. I'm your constituent in district 1. And I share all these concerns. They're all valid. What I see missing we're not talking to each other. I'm an engineer retired. The first good step in systems engineering process is to get the requirements right. Until we all sit down and talk with each other, that's not going to happen and that needs to be before anything else.
>> Thank you, ma'am. Can I ask you what's your name again? I'm sorry. [ APPLAUSE ]

>>> Kathy Mattingly.

>> Bill: --

>> Mattingly. Thank you very much. Welcome. [ APPLAUSE ]

>>> Hello, my name is nagesh. I'm a 19 year resident of san José. As I'm listening to everybody talk here, I'm thinking why is there so much friction? There should be apple pie. Last time I was talking to sergio, he kept repeating we haven't got to the point of talking about who goes in there yet. Why is there so much friction? Maybe the problem is the process. We should be talking about who goes in first and then talk about what we put in place. Seems to me that was done, there would be less friction here. Because as everybody says, homelessness is a misused word or more broadly used word. I think there would be more support if you were able to define who you're going to help with the 20 units of the 7,000 people. Thank you.

>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Welcome.

>>> Hi, my name is Diana tong. There is one issue. The city created a Department of Housing in 1987 when the santa Clara county housing authority should be responsible for it. So, we are giving all our tax es to the county of Santa Clara that you're one of the biggest city if not the biggest city that you should be making them accountable for the money that they take from us for measure a, you should be asking them to be responsible for the homeless and make good buildings, good places where they can put them, not in the neighborhoods. So, I suggest that instead of you having double -- two same type of employment -- employers doing the same job, you're double dipping the city and the county. Only one institution should be responsible for homeless and since we're giving all our money to the county of Santa Clara, you should have somebody going and lobbying or making them responsible.
>> Thank you, ma’am.

>>> For that.

>> Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

>> Hello, Phil, welcome. Phil is the last card I’ve got. Oh, Shirley steger. If you otherwise want to speak, please come on down. Hi, Phil.

>>> Thank you, mr. mayor. and I want to say my name is Phil master call. I am homeless advocate for six years. I want to observe that everyone here in this room, some in this room are working very hard. This last couple of weeks, a lot of people worked hard. The neighborhood residents that are here and some that aren’t here because there’s not the hundreds that I witnessed in these meetings have worked very hard. This housing department over the last two years have been excruciatingly hard work. The apartment -- I can’t even remember all the stuff they’ve been doing, incredible. The advocates have worked hard. Service providers. You councilmembers, especially you the last couple weeks. Some of these tough meetings have worked very hard. And the staff all on behalf of homeless people in our city, and they have been working real hard every day getting up and going out and doing what they need to do. But it is only now realized that with all this hard work we have barely crossed the surface of doing the job to house them and to help them.

>> Thank you.

>>> And there is so much more to do. This is how complex this is. Appreciate your work tonight.

>> Thank you.

>>> Giving us all. Thank you.

>> Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

>> Welcome, ma’am.
My name is Bobby Powell. I think my name was called earlier.

Okay.

I didn't hear. I'm from district 9, thousand oaks area. And I thank you all. I question the wisdom of tiny homes in our area in San José. The design stirs our imagination and it recalls the beauty of National Park, you know, tent camping, et cetera. But is it a fit for an area that is so, so lean on open space, on land? The one commodity we have so little of is land and space. The fact that district 9, our park was the only place that you could target for our district as, oh, it's the only place left, let's put it in the park. The fact that so many residential areas are being targeted, you know, makes you wonder if it's really a good solution. I really encourage the use of vacant commercial industrial county land that's large enough to take a larger bite out of the problem. A vacant business park would have bathrooms and showers, cafeteria, et cetera.

Thank you.

Thank you much.

Welcome. [APPLAUSE]

And Sean cartwright. Welcome.

Hi, I live in district 10. I've been a real estate agent for over 30 years. And I'm here to say that we want to help the homeless, but not by giving up our property values. No one wants to buy next to a homeless camp and so sellers will have to drop their prices in order to get their homes sold. And some people will lose their homes. I don't believe any board should be allowed to pick who loses their home value when the rest of San José gets to keep theirs. Please come up with another solution. If you have to have tiny homes which I do not think is the answer, please find another place for them in a commercial residential or rural area where if it gets developed after people know that they're buying next to homeless. Don't put the homeless next to the people that are already there, please. Thank you. [CHEERING AND APPLAUDING]
Welcome.

Shirley Steger, District 10. On a personal note, when I walked to the state of California building, I get off the light rail and I see in the little doorways of the old theater, people sleeping in their wheelchairs. We've got a serious problem. I've been down here many times. I didn't plan to speak tonight. But here I am. I also live in District 10 and I know they don't want it in their backyard. I read on the next door site that they should put them all on a bus and send them to some remote area. What have we become? Such a discompassionate -- we are part of the city. District 10 is part of the city. We should take this burden just like the East side, that North side, the West side. We're all in this together and these homeless people, I support the law foundation memo that they wrote to you. And that we should get moving on this bridge housing. Winter is coming. [CHEERING AND APPLAUDING]

Welcome, Sean.

I think that the voice that's been missing the most tonight aside from Robert is the voice of the unhoused. And we as organizers felt that we couldn't bring them tonight because it has been so vitriolic and hateful, the meeting at the Hayes mansion and the meeting you hosted. The homeless were there and they tried to speak. They were shouted down at the Hayes mansion and they were verbally attacked at your meeting. And we didn't feel that it was safe for them to be here just to be hated on. They're people. They need homes. They need to be treated like everybody else. They are in every single community. They need to be treated like your family members. Your family members, if they were unhoused, if they had addiction problems, if they had mental health problems, these are our neighbors. Treat them like that. Continued delays just bring about more death. [APPLAUSE]

Nevar and Sachin. Please forgive me for mispronouncing your name.

I'm a resident of District 2 and my father is a homeowner in District 10. I spent my morning in a way that I didn't want or expect, taking clothes and money to a San José man who after 17 years in this country is being deported and leaving his wife and two children behind. They are another family on the verge of homelessness. To all of those behind me afraid of exposing their children to the effects of broken systems that disproportionately affect women, people of
color and immigrants, put this into perspective. You have a mother putting her children to bed tonight having to explain why their father isn't coming home. You can talk to your kids about why there is a bridge housing community in your neighborhood. I support bridge housing in my community and I encourage the city council to do the same. Thank you.

>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>>> Hello, mayor and councilmembers. I just want to make it clear, I do work for the vice mayor, but I'm not representing her right now. I am representing my nonprofit, in their shoes. And I really wanted to talk about an encampment sweep that was happening yesterday. Most of the speakers that came before you that are not supportive of the bridge housing communities do not want anything in their neighborhoods, anything near their parks, anything near schools. Yesterday an encampment which is not near parks, which is not near schools, which isn't near any residential was getting swept. So, even the people that are being pushed to the very edges of our city, not near any residences, they are still getting pushed around.

And, so, what are our options? Where do they go? We have before you a solution. What I've heard today, there are a lot of misconceptions about the homeless. A lot of education needs to go out in these community meetings, just debunk these myths of drug users. Most people that are homeless used to be housed in Santa Clara county.

>> Thank you.

>>> Thank you so much. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Joanie santos. I might be misreading it. Joanie. If you're filling out a card, just come on up. We'll hear you. Hand the card after you come up. That would be fine.

>>> Yeah, hi. I'm Joanie santos, I am a resident of district 10. I am in favor of tiny houses. Do you know how many homeless people live in the creeks out in district 10? Where is mr. khamis? Every time I come to speak he's not here. [ LAUGHTER ]

>>> You know, these people are already our neighbors. They buy things from the stores in our district. They walk around. We say hello to each other. I have worked for the winter faith coalition for two years now. I am a social worker. I've been working with the homeless since
2006 here in this city. There is nothing to be afraid of. The tiny homes are an incredible improvement over what we've got. I know they are just one piece of the puzzle, but they are a very necessary piece. By the time you put someone in a tiny home, it restores their dignity. It restores their ability to work. It keeps our entire district cleaner and safer. This is absolutely necessary. Please, bring on the tiny homes.

>> Thank you, ma'am. [CHEERING AND APPLAUDING]

>> Stephanie? Come on up, Stephanie. After Stephanie is Matthew Warren and then tina, come on up when you're done.

>>> Hi, my name is Stephanie and I live in district 10. I'm 31 years old. I purchased my town house six years ago. I have a 5 and 6-year-Old, and i feel like this is taking a turn that I didn't expect. And I feel personally attacked that people are saying that we are not compassionate, and I am. I'm doing care packages for the homeless with my children, okay. We have a problem in San José. But your constituents, we are putting it upon you as elected officials to be our voice. I live literally across the street from where the proposed site is on branham and Monterey. There was a gun found at Eden Dale park. My kids did a lemon ade stand there three weeks ago. I'm not going to want to bring my kids to the park and do things like that with them. There's a problem, I get it. I feel that the voice of our neighborhood is being heard, but as someone said at the last meeting at hayes mansion when your plan doesn't workout you need to replan.

>> Thank you. Matthew? [ APPLAUSE ]

>>> Council, my name is Matthew Warren. I'm here on behalf of law foundation of Silicon Valley. But actually I'd like to speak more as a resident of San José tonight I think it's offensive that we are excluding people who are living on the street from our neighborhoods. People deserve to live in homes, under a roof. And I can't believe that we've gone from over 100 options for sites to house people to four. All because of just hate and unfair stereo types. Please, move forward with the mayor's memo. Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Tina Morrow.
Hi, good evening, my name is Tina More Owe. I'm a homeowner. I live in the neighborhood Taylor and Guadalupe is part of my neighborhood. And I want to say I am in full support of the bridge housing project. I'm in support of it, the concept in general. And I am in support of us being one of the sites. I think that it will be fine. The fact of the matter is the homeless are here. They are part of our social and our community fabric. Everybody needs a home. We need to stop with the analysis paralysis and we need to move forward on this project. And I have listed a few ideas that I have up there. I hope that you'll take those into consideration. I want to say, driving in, I saw a sign on City Hall that said we welcome everyone. It didn't say we welcome everyone unless you're homeless. It said we welcome everyone. Everybody should be welcome. You can count on my support with this project. Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

Thank you. Welcome. Please.

Hi, my name is Kathryn Hedges and I'm with pact. I haven't had a chance to confer with the rest of the group, but we -- last time we talked we definitely supported Tina inhouses. We support as many possibilities at possible to provide people homes. They are a part of our community. And just because the ones we see in the parks may be people that we wouldn't want to hang out with doesn't mean that everybody is homeless is like them. We have such an affordable housing crisis here that a lot of people are ending up homeless who don't fit the stereotype. People do, they are still human beings they still need a place to live. Thank you very much.

Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

Michael Branson.

Good evening. Michael Branson, district 6 resident. I just wanted to be on record tonight. I know there's been a lot of opinion. I just wanted to be here to say I'm really supportive of moving forward with as many as we can, as many tiny home sites as possible. I think, you know, whether we do it or not, we're all going to have to bear the burden. They're already part of our community. So, let's really step up and I think every district should play a role in helping to provide homes for the homeless. Thank you.
>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> And margarita galleta. Okay. I want to thank everyone who has come out to speak. Obviously there's a lot of passion. Are you ms. galleta? Okay, could you please come down?

>>> I didn't think I was going to be called right away.

>>> Sorry, I'm a little slow, knee surgery.

>> Welcome. You made it.

>>> Yes. Thank you very much. I'm for housing for the homeless and for our veterans. I just wanted to add a suggestion. That instead of building little houses this way, I think we should build little apartments this way so that we are utilizing our land better and being able to have more affordable or units for the homeless and veterans. We could have studios, one bedroom, two bedrooms. But with the cost of property being so expensive, I think we should consider -- I don't know if it's too late, but consider building upward instead of this way. And also make it like a village for them so that they have what most of us dream about and have worked so hard for, and for some reason these individuals have ended up homeless.

>> Thank you, ma'am.

>>> Thank you.

>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Yes, ma'am, please.

>>> My name is Jessica Dickinson goodman. I own a home in district 2, a block away from the proposed site. I am in support of tiny homes being added to district 2, district 10, and every district in between, including 1. I'm here a little bit late because there is a home on fire on East saint John street. The fire fighters have stopped a bunch of traffic. But it reminded me what it feels like to walk around downtown san José, like our homes are on fire without anyplace for our homeless to go. We all come together when a neighbor needs a place to stay
when something urgent happens. But living without a home is urgent every day and I thank all of my friends who were able to get here before I was and speak in support of adding more homeless to our communities and more housing for our homeless neighbors and sisters. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Again, I want to thank everyone who spoke so passionately on this issue on all sides of this issue. Obviously this issue arouses passion for a lot of good reasons. People have invested their livelihoods and their neighborhood and in their homes. And we are a city like every major city on the West coast struggling mightily with more than 4,000 homeless residents. I think it's 4350 at last count. And we are challenged mightily to solve this very difficult problem. I also want to apologize for my tardiness. I stepped out at about 3:00 for a meeting with Senator Kamala Harris. She was here at City Hall. One of the topics of conversation was about cdbg home funding which we know is critically important Federal Dollars for homeless construction and services. So, we appreciate very much that there's a lot of frustration and anger out there. We heard the message loud and clear that there's a strong desire for a hard reset and a need for a hard reset. I have heard very carefully from those who I was present for, and that was I think the majority. For example, I think Kathy Mattingly spoke eloquently about the need for us to talk with each other rather than talking past each other. And there is a lot of need for more information going both ways, going both Watz. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> I think it's important for folks to recognize, for example, that this is the first time the council will have had the opportunity to review or comment on the site selection criteria since it's been modified. That there has been no tiny house design that's been presented to the community yet. I know we've got top architect gensler, the most expensive architect in the world designing tiny home designs for us, to present it to the community and to talk with the community about what is acceptable and what's not. We've got an rfp that went out to -- for a program developer and operator and that's really, really important because how you manage affordable housing makes all the difference about whether it's -- it works or not. Both for the housing, the housed as well as those who live around it. And we need to have whoever it is who is going to be managing this project or several projects there in the community answering questions. What services are going to be provided? What security is going to be provided? What are the rules? What are the safety measures? What are the operation? That's critical
information every community needs to hear. And so clearly we've heard the need to do reset and to have the kind of conversation that will ensure that everyone has information. I heard, I think, a lot of very articulate views on both sides. I heard from Chris block I think something that is really, really important for all of us to think about. He said it very simply. He said this is really hard. I know it's tempting. It's really tempting to come up to the mic and say, there's a better way and here's my idea. And there's a wealth of homelessness. And believe me, if any of those simplistic solutions actually worked, you wouldn't see every major city on the West coast from Seattle and Portland all the way down to San Diego and L.A. in a crisis of homelessness. And it is, by the way, no question an issue of resources, yes. Resources matter and that's why I was lobbying Senator Kamala Harris. But, by the way, it's not just resources because that bond we just passed, the $700 million of that bond that's going to be dedicated for homeless housing out of the 950 million, none of those dollars actually get anybody housed. You actually have to build housing in real-time and space, in real places in the city. Or in the county. And as we've discovered, because we've done a lot of studying and a lot of surveys of our homeless population, it turns out that the overwhelming majority, many encampments, more than 80%, sometimes more than 90% of those folks who are homeless were housed in the city of San José in apartments in our city before they became homeless. So, it's fair to say they're ours. They're part of our community. And I -- [ APPLAUSE ]

>> And I say this -- I say this because I am not saying that the concerns of neighbors are unreasonable. They're very reasonable concerns. The fear is real. I get it. And we absolutely have to be clear about addressing those concerns. But I heard very clearly from, for example, Rodney Meyer. He said, don't make district 2 the dumping ground for these projects. I heard similar sentiment obviously from others. And I appreciate that, except I've been in district 2 and i have heard loudly the complaints from district 2 residents about homeless who are in the creeks and in the parks and in the streets. And guess what? They're there whether you house them or not. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> So, there's no question we need a reset to think about how we can broaden our options and that's part of the sentiment behind -- I know two of the memorandams as we look for options for housing sites. Certainly public land that is owned and vacant, the water district, the county vta and other public agencies that's absolutely critical, that we look at these other omgss. We know there are more options out there and we hope these other agencies are going to be forthcoming. We know the housing department has been working to try to get other sites
identified. And we'll look at other sites throughout the city. But there's no other magic city where we put homeless people who are homeless in San José. So, this is just one of many hard conversations we're going to have. It doesn't get any easier just because we passed a big bond measure because, guess what, we've got to go find lots of places to build housing. Martha made a very good point when she came to the mic and said it's a lot better if you build vertically in apartments. By the way, we're doing that right now. We have 697 units of affordable housing focused primarily for homeless, currently under construction, leveraging millions of dollars of other investment because our housing department is working so hard To make this happen. And by the way, most of these sites, if you think we're just trying to clear downtown with the homeless, overwhelming majority of these units and sites are in and around the downtown, okay. So, it's not like somehow or other we're displacing them from somewhere else. It just happens that homeless are everywhere in our city. We're building vertically. The challenge is we build these vertical apartments -- face it, it's not everywhere you can go build six stories. The cost of doing so is about $550,000, $600,000 a unit. We need innovative solutions because you're not going to get everybody housed at $600,000 a unit. It us didn't work in the real world. Tiny homes is one solution we are trying to explore. Not all of them work. We tried sanctioned encampments. We couldn't find anyone To monitor every single one of them. We're moving on. We have to fail forward. We have to try things. Pilot it, make sure we are hearing the community strongly and clearly. Do everything we can to provide supportive services and security where it's needed. Let's do it at a small size, and let's see how we can make this work. And if it can't work, we close it up and we try the next idea. But one thing we know is that the current state of affairs is not the solution. We cannot continue to do the same things we've been doing And expect this problem to get solved. So, we're going to keep trying a lot of solutions and they're not all going to be popular out of the gate. I know that. And it's going to take a lot of hard work. And no matter what the design looks like or anything else, it's going to be hard telling any community, by the way, whether it's businesses or residents, that you might have homeless, formerly homeless residents living housed in your community. But this morning as I got on my bike and I ride to the gym, i rode past the park where I saw two or three homeless folks about a block from my house. Then I rode along heading street near an industrial area where I saw several homeless folks living along the railroad tracks. I went over near Coleman. There is a guy right at the entrance of the shopping center asking for money. And it Donned on me, we can build housing for any of these folks. The fact that they're present or not present isn't going to change any. They're still
in my community. So, I think we're all safer and they're safer if we actually get them housed. And that's what I'd like to do. [APPLAUSE]

>> We've got a lot of good ideas from my colleagues and from the community about how we can do this better, and certainly staff has been working very hard on this. I think we have the best housing staff in the country. I know not everybody will agree if you just had a hearing in your neighborhood about this. But, by the way, they've got a really, really, I would say the hardest job in the city. So, I look forward to discussion with my colleagues. Obviously we put out a memorandum with some ideas and I know we'll hear more ideas as we continue this conversation. Councilmember Jimenez.

>> Thank you, mayor. Thank you, staff, so much for bringing this important issue forward. Thank you to the community members for coming out. I know you've -- I've seen firsthand the passion. I put that in quotations because sometimes it's gone a little over board, but I appreciate the presence and the engagement. I think it's very important. And I do think that that's, if nothing else comes from this, that's part of the silver lining I can appreciate that folks are engaged. Paying attention. So, I think that's important. I just want to begin by asking a few questions from staff. You know, there's been talk about reaching out to VTA, Cal Trans, water district, a host of other agencies. And I realize no one's provided us a list of properties. So, what I'm curious about is can you touch a little bit on what the challenges are? I mean, is it just a return of calls? What's happening?

>> Councilmember, in the case of the water district, we've had a number of really good conversations. The district has an ad hoc committee on homelessness and they're working on some of these issues as well. We've been working closely with their staff and they're trying to do an evaluation of all their sites before providing us with a list of sites that they think could work. But there has been communication from staff. We've also been working with the county closely. There has been less discussion about sites in particular, but we have talked about services funding and partnership, making sure that these projects are successful because a lot of the clients that would be coming through these programs would have the rapid rehousing subsidies or permanent supportive housing subsidies that are ultimately funded by the county largely. So, we've had discussions there. Less sites from the county. There have been some promising leads, but at the same time hasn't been a direction necessarily from their boards.
and from their directors to provide sites. That sort of direction can lead to more fruitful results potentially.

>> Would you say that the same applies to getting a list of sites from vta as well? Is that sort of the same situation where they are gathering information or doing what they do and --

>> Councilmember, I'd say that staff follow the direction of elected bodies. So, moving forward through other elected boards, whether it's the vta board or the county board of supervisors is a potential route to get more results.

>> Okay, thank you. You know, in district 2, the beginning of the line for light rail is there, and obviously i know the vta have some properties around there that are essentially sitting vacant. So, and then the other thing that I know to be true is that half the vta board is actually current or former elected officials from the city of san José and so to the extent that some of my colleagues that are on that board can help push along the conversation to the extent they think that's feasible I think it would be wonderful.

>>> The other question I have, this may be a loaded question, but that sort of seems to be the tenor of a lot of what's going on. It is a very real question for me. And I realize I haven't asked you this in my office or anything. But the question is this. If you had to redo this process, this whole, just how we've gotten here today, would we do anything differently? Is there like, in retrospect, do you look and think maybe We should have done this first or -- please.

>> Clearly we should have done something differently. So, you know, our original idea was we were going to come to council, ten sites, just drop it. Right there so that you all would have something to say. And we realize that was a terrible approach, that we really need to start doing some community outreach. And we didn't have all the information. We thought working with smaller groups would be more helpful before we would go out. But we would probably rethink it and start with more just of an educational conversation first because clearly what we continue to hear over and over again is misinformation.

>> Right.
So, while we were waiting, that would have been a more fruitful effort which just would have been starting to do general education on the topic.

And I should say, so I appreciate your candor. And if I may say very publicly, I know there's a lot of residents from my district here. If I had to do it again, I would have engaged the community a little sooner instead of taking a back seat and waiting, let's see how this could develop. [CHEERING AND APPLAUDING]

And I say that because I'm not afraid to take ownership for mistakes that we've made or things that we could do differently and better. So, I certainly acknowledge that and recognize that moving forward. The other question I had is with regard to 20, 25 units per site, is there -- is that like some -- is there a rhyme or reason to that exact number? I mean, is there any reason it couldn't be ten instead of 25 or --

I mean, we were thinking scale of some sort.

Right.

So, something like ten becomes even more expensive than something like 20. But 20 seemed like a good start in terms of attempting to create a community. And we have traditionally had, in terms of case management, one person per 20, and so it seemed like a good number to start off with.

Okay. Thank you. And then I just have a few comments. You know, over the years I spent countless hours interacting with our homeless population. I know we had folks up here from the law foundation of silicon valley. And I spent many years working at the mental health advocacy project which is a program within the law foundation. And day in, day out, I would interview homeless folks. During my many years at the public defenders office, I spent many hours locating, spending time talking with individuals at homeless camps across our county, yes, they have them in milpitas, to Gilroy, the reexancing center to the compassion center in Gilroy. -- reception center to the compassion center in Gilroy. I say that because I think everyone can recognize there is a housing crisis, and certainly for our most vulnerable residents it's a daily struggle living on the streets. And like many of my colleagues, I believe that permanent solutions, permanent housing is a solution, but I also recognize it is going to
take some time to get there. So, doing nothing is not an option in my eyes. And, so, I think it is very important we start working on and supporting all alternatives potential lip on the table to help bring housing online and create some support in the interim.

>>> Now, I want to -- and this may not be very popular for some folks, but I want to state very clearly that I am supportive of bridge housing as one of many ways to try to address the homeless situation. However, I did state from the beginning of my engagement on this issue that once I realized the sites were dwindled down from 99 to 4, to 3, which are -- and now two, which are effectively in my district, it certainly concerned me. And I heard the residents' concerns. And that reduction from 99 to 2, essentially, it took place before I could -- I feel adequately broach the subject with my residents. Really that was the point of the 21st, the meeting on the 21st at the hayes mansion. But I realize it was very difficult that day to have a constructive dialogue as many, i think, residents and rightfully so to a certain extent wanted to be heard. I didn't really care to -- or didn't -- weren't interested in hearing all the details and all the facts. I think it's also important to recognize that, you know, we talk a lot about the council giving direction to move forward with bridge housing. But I think it's important to think about the context. And we have four new councilmembers. Frankly, I wasn't here when we made that decision. And I say that because I would have like to have been in on those decisions. Obviously I wasn't and i understand that's how it works. But I recognize now that, certainly I can only speak To myself, to truly engage the community in a dialogue on the issues of the homelessness is To me, seems to be the correct way to begin the process. And that's why I inserted -- We inserted some of the things into that memo. And, quite frankly, process has been one of the main concerns that I've had with this whole thing. Not necessarily the concept of bridge housing. It's been more the process because I think it's -- I think if we as a community have a very open and Frank dialogue, that i think we all recognize there Is an issue and I think deep down i think we want to do the right thing if we have all the information. And, so, just trying to put my thoughts together. And, so, I can assure you that I stand firm in my values and beliefs in helping the most vulnerable residents. One of the reasons I ran for office was to try to give a voice to residents who are often not engaged and also residents living on the streets, folks who are marginalized in society who don't have a seat at the table. I'm going to continue to do that. And, so, but let me just conclude with this. You know, as I mentioned earlier, the silver lining of folks coming out and being engaged I think has been a positive thing, but I think it's also important to call out the very publicly and say that the dialogue that has emerged through this process has been unfortunate. From chants of build the wall, abhorring
comments about the homeless, other comments about the community. They are unhelpful and untrue and they don't contribute positively to the discourse in our city. And I think especially now -- [ APPLAUSE ]

>> -- when our national discourse, quite frankly, is in the toilet, we need to rise above that and I know that we're better than that. And I think we all should demand better. And, so, with that being said, i want to move approval of the memo prepared by councilmember Don Rocha. I think it does a good job of bridging together some of the statements and ideas expressed by the mayor, councilmember Karasko, councilmember arenas and councilmember Jones. I think it does a good job of merging those ideas with the memo of councilmember Davis, Khamis and I put together. So, I'll move that for approval.

>> Thank you, councilmember. Just to clarify, that was councilmember Rocha's memorandum? Okay. So, that's the current motion. Councilmember Khamis.

>> Thank you, mayor. And I just want to tell all of you that I'm listening. We are listening here. We have heard you loud and clear. I know I represent constituents and I think all of us up here, we're not here as politicians. We are public servants and we're trying to address very difficult issues to address. You know, I've had three meetings on this issue. I think we shared one. And I've heard you telling us your concerns about safety. I've heard you telling us your concerns about your property values, your serenity. And I heard you loud and clear. I do as a public servant need to address the fact that we need to do something. And I think the memo that We struck is a balance to create this task force to look at ideas that are a little more understandable and palatable and achievable, and maybe more cost-effective. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> I think this memo forces us to examine other options like We stated specific things like helping streamline the process of auxiliary units. These are units that I hope that even our housing department can fund that might be a good way to fund these with the expectation of allowing those people who are building these units to house one or two vulnerable populations. Maybe a homeless mother. Maybe a homeless foster youth and yet them. And actually help the owners of the people who are willing to adopt this unit in their backyard, give them either financing or give them the entire money to build the houses. We have lots of houses that qualify for these auxiliary units. I think that's a discussion worth having. It will help us build and add to our housing base. The current, the current program, it won't work, allowing people
to put the tiny homes next to residential. I mean, we've heard that loud and clear, and I'm glad we're going forward. I hope we go forward with a task force on looking at ways that we can look at other ideas. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Jackie, I heard from you loud and clear we have 582 permanent units to be constructed for homeless, is it just for homeless or -- I had the mayor bring up another number, 697. Can you parse out what's the difference?

>> Yes. So, the 582 was the supportive housing developments that are in three developments that we've already approved and are moving forward.

>> Great. Jackie, and I've asked this before and I get concerned about a lot of times -- and I know you're always dealing with divergent directions from council sometimes. And we send you off to examine different areas and it's because we want to do more. We always want to do more to house the homeless. We always want to build more housing. Are we having problems building these housing? Because some of these, I think we passed more than two years ago that I recall. Like, for example, the plaza, i thought passed more than a year ago now. And I thought it would be -- it was going to be one of those quicker approaches. Could you let me know how the plaza hotel or the other hotel that we're doing, is it on time and on budget like everybody likes to hear?

>> Sure. So, the plaza hotel is actually going to be opening up next month.

>> Yeah.

>> And so we're very excited about that. That's a downtown motel we were able to acquire. It was behind schedule. It took a little longer to get through all the planning processes and then to resolve some planning issues regarding the fire code. So, it was delayed.

>> Yeah. I'm almost -- I would like us to think of hiring somebody who could just speed up the process for your department so that we can get more of these things that we already approved built. [ APPLAUSE ]
I don't think that we can -- I don't think that we could think our way out of this process. I think we need to build our way out of this problem. And we need to look at ways to build more and build faster. And this is why the recommendation included the ideas of potentially the housing department becoming a lone agent for the auxiliary units. And I'm hoping that you take that seriously because a lot of homes -- I think we have thousands of potential sites that we can expand, even if somebody wants to build them for their aging mother or father, it still will help us with low income people. And, so, one of the things that I'd like to see is solution-based achievable solutions that are affordable. And I think this is one of the reasons why I supported this task force being created. We need to think and identify as much as we can places where we can build obviously, and I think that would be a good solution. But clearly we need to do more. I'm very much in support of the compromise memo of councilmember Rocha that did try to include some of the concerns from the other memo writers and I will be supporting the current motion on the floor. Again, I also want to thank, thank the housing staff. This is a very difficult issue. I was there at those meetings when I think things got heated. I appreciate your patience And your support. I just hope that we can have you focus on building, building, building because that's the only way that we can solve this issue, so, thank you.  

I think that's a good place to ask a few questions, Jackie. Because I know that's what you're trying to do right now, is to build something. We went to tiny homes because we can build tiny homes much more quickly and a lot less expensively than a project which we know has a four-year cycle time between planning and construction. And as I mention, costs between 550 and $600,000 a unit. I want to look at a couple recommendations whether or not they really help us improve the speeds. If you're now sent out to go identify commercial industrial sites, that means presumably they're owned by a private party, not us, is that right?

I assume they would have to be because we don't have any commercial or industrial sites.

We don't own them.

Correct.

That means we have to negotiate either the acquisition of the site or we have to go lease it. So, how much time does that take?
We would have to first identify someone who could do that for us, so that would be step number one.

We have to go find a broker.

Correct.

All right. And we have to search for a whole lot of sites. And we're either going to buy them or lease them depending on how much money we have and what they're willing to do.

Correct.

That takes several months in the case of both sites? Okay. Then we have to get land use and permit entitlements, right? Some of those industrial sites, you need a general plan amendment, don't you?

So, for ab 2176 we would not need a general plan amendment because we can -- we don't have to do that.

Okay.

But we would, then, since we've been moving down the direction of building these bridge communities, if we're looking at a commercial site then we'd have to look at it developing another or develop a different type of building code in order to address those issues. So, while there's a lot of flexibility, we didn't contemplate actually utilizing a building like a commercial building so we'd have to do some work there.

Right. So, you don't get the advantage of the state legislation which enables you to do it cheaper, faster. You've got to comply with state building code --

No, we're still -- we just have to create our own building code. But the building code we've been working on has to do with building --
>> Building something new.

>> Correct.

>> I get it.

>> Having to do a rehab is different.

>> Rehabilitating industrial commercial building, everybody has to go back to the drawing board and come up with a new code. Figure out how we can do it safely, and still do it quickly, or more quickly than the state would allow. Then you have to do community outreach there, too, right?

>> Correct. And as we are experiencing tonight, there's no, there's no way to bypass community outreach to be effective. If we had any mistake here, it was trying to expedite a project regardless where it was sited we're going to need time.

>> I want to show there is no shorts cut here. We can find sites other people own and pretend we can build it faster on other sites. But the idea of eliminating every single site that the city owns and then for us to go to other agencies and say, we're going to use your public land but we're not going to use our public land, and then the sites that we're going to go find -- [ APPLAUSE ]

>> -- are going to be sites that somebody else owns. We have to go buy and lease and go through all this process. If we really pursue this in Ernest, this idea of commercial industrial sites and decide not to pursue the city-owned sites, we just added two years easily to this process. To get anything going. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> And so it's just as important for us to hold ourselves accountable here that if we think we've got a shortcut here, we don't. And if our objective is to try to find a solution through this process with this particular tool in the tool box, this won't get it there. Now, certainly there are other tools as well. We've been trying a lot of those and none of those are easy either. But I just want to suggest it's a really bad idea for us to eliminate any city owned property for the list of potential sites. You've already narrowed your options and right now we don't need to
narrow the options, we need to broaden the options. And I think we need to be honest with the community about the reality of just how hard it is to go do this on commercial industrial land.

>>> Councilmember prossa.

>> Thank you, mayor. Absolutely very difficult, and not just that as what your last statement was, but just in general. This entire issue. First off, thank you to the community members that came out. Staff, for your hard work on this continually. My colleagues obviously for your passion and commitment to this cause. I want to highlight just a couple things that I didn't hear which I really did appreciate. Only one public comment came out and stated with an ending, I don't think it was fully sincere, but the message was just put them anywhere. It was preceded by a mention of the fairgrounds, though. But other than that, nobody that came here to speak passionately from their own community added to that, put them anywhere, or said, let's put our homeless community members in Gilroy or in another city or let's ship them out which I know very well, as councilmember Jimenez does, we do hear a lot of that through next door, online, I think people feel a little bit more comfortable maybe saying something so rash. I unfortunately have heard it directly to my face from some of my own community members here in district 3 that feel as though they've had enough. And I've heard it from time to time. And I just want to recognize that as passionate as this argument has been for all of our community members here, I did not hear that and I real I do appreciate that from our community members. I think that we absolutely live in a wonderful city, one that is inclusive, one that does recognize what we put outside of our City Hall. And albeit at times, issues like this are difficult. I like to hear when individuals speak up and say we want to be part of the solution. We don't believe that you can just somehow sweep this issue as it might be called, or sweep these people away. And, so, I appreciate that. I do want to mention that to all the community members that were here. Thank you for that and for owning the fact that we have absolutely a homeless problem here within our own city. And we do need to be able to take that ownership and do something about it.

>>> Now, how we respond to that and what we're doing, absolutely no easy task. And as those of you that are maybe just getting involved because one of these particular projects has come across your neighborhood or for those of you that have been involved for years, to our community members here that are actually homeless, you are well aware of the difficulties of trying to solve for homelessness. So, nonetheless, a tremendous task. We do have in front of
us today an opportunity to look at one piece of the solution. Bridge housing communities is a, actually a statewide opportunity. Somebody asked if San José is the only one trying to resolve this. The opportunity for bridge housing opportunities came about through a statewide opportunity and one that we are attempting to take advantage of. I know we have the two issues here, mayor, I’m taking a pause for formality here. We have the issues for 4.2.

>> We have a motion. My inclination was we take 4.2 first, then we take 4.1.

>> I won't say much on that. This is one of the opportunities we have to take up 4.1 next, really began the conversation around temporary short-term solutions. And the idea which one that i support in legalized encampment, absolutely is not a long-term or favorable solution. And maybe bridge housing, right, it's not -- again, that most favorable solution. I would absolutely agree with one of the speakers that came up as well that said, why don't We stack these on top of one another and build an affordable complex. Guess what, we've approved a number of those right here in my district and those aren't easy either. In fact, one of the things that I'm hoping -- I'm going to ask of everybody that has come out today -- that when you get that opportunity in your community to support a project that is a long-term fully developed affordable complex that can house formerly homeless to those that are struggling to just make ends meet through this New measure a housing bond, when you get that opportunity, I hope you welcome that with open arms. If you might not have been in support of these bridge housing opportunities, I hope you open your arms and say, I'll take a full fledged development in my community, because that is -- beyond that, there is no other solution. Beyond permanent supportive housing, there is no other solution. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> So, I just put that out there as foresight, because that's coming. $950 million is going to be multiplied by the county and they're going to be coming in front of you and we're going to be coming with them all across the county to be able to try to build long-term permanent solutions. But, again, those aren’t easy either and these are the same kind of conversations that we may have. But if you don't support that, there’s nothing else beyond that. Because then your only solution is to get rid of the problem and that's not going to happen. So, we need to be able to take responsibility and do that. This is one of shows short-term temporary solutions that we want to see if we could take advantage of. Nonetheless, knew it was going to be difficult to do so. I have experienced this a number of times already within my district. Not easy to do. And I understand that for some of my colleagues, they were not here when we made the
commitment to try to locate one of these in every single district because, as we know, there are homeless in every single district. Certainly disproportionate in certain areas, and I own that right here as the representative of downtown, which is why we disproportionately here in downtown push for more solutions. But there are homeless all over the entire city. And when we made that commitment, again, some of my colleagues were not here. But we as a full council made that commitment to say we want to be part of the solution. And you can look at some of the statistics as our housing department put up. And that's not the case right now. It is absolutely not the case where we have solutions all across the city. Granted, it's also not the case where we have it all across the county or the bay area. And I know somebody mentioned, why not atherton. Yes, I agree with that, but i can't make a decision on atherton. I can only make a decision here in San José unfortunately. But I agree with you on that. So, we made that commitment. And I know some of my colleagues are facing some of that, that tough -- those tough conversations for the first time. I would agree, as councilmember Jimenez pointed out and as the housing staff was willing to admit, they could go back and do this again. There is absolutely a better way to do it clearly. You said clearly, right? I don't think we would have had this much misunderstanding and this much frustration -- and we heard it from a number of community members today. We heard it from a number of you today. A lot of this was process that you're frustrated by. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> Some of you say I don't want it in general, but a lot of you said this process was terrible, and we want to see something different. And I would agree with that. I would agree with and appreciate councilmember Jimenez and Jackie, yourself, the housing department, and equally myself and all my colleagues taking ownership for that. That's something we need to be able to fix as we move forward because we absolutely need more support as we go across, not only with bridge housing communities, temporary solutions, but we absolutely need support as we are going forward with permanent solutions. And if this is an indication, any indication of the kind of challenges we're going to have as we try to produce more solutions to get our homeless off the street and into housing, we're in for a tough road and i don't wish any of us that. So, I'm hoping we absolutely get it right. As the mayor stated and the rest of, I think my colleagues have highlighted. Certainly this is a reset. We've made it to this point where we have to look at what is the next step. We certainly have hit the pause button and we have a number of, I think, ideas that have floated around. And I want to be able to, i guess, just try to see if we can't find a compromise in regards to the direction that we currently have in front of
us with -- thank you for putting that up -- with the memorandum that my colleague councilmember Rocha attempted to put together to make some consensus here.

>>> There are a couple things that stand out to me that i can't agree with. And the mayor highlighted number one, which is eliminating all the city-owned sites. So, not only would that obviously put us down to no options now from the 99 that we had started with, and by no means am I or -- I don't think anybody up here are trying to say or advocate for any one individual of those sites. But if we just eliminate all of them right out the gate, and then we follow it up with trying to go and ask our partner agencies for them to step up and produce some property, well, that's being hypocritical. That's not showing good faith, a good partnership. We're not taking responsibility with at least the opportunities we may have. We may determine that as we move forward with whatever number of sites that we have, my recommendation is to maintain the ten, at least continue To maintain that as a direction that we move forward on. We may not find all ten are going to work. We may not find ten sites all across the city or one in every single council district. But if we don't strive for that, if we just shut that door now and try to pass the buck, I can guarantee you we're just dragging this problem out. We might as well not even pursue this temporary option of bridge housing communities. Because we're not going to get there. We might as well tell people, you're going to have to wait five years until we can actually house a couple hundred people when we finish this development. Because that's the road that we're headed down, I think, if we just completely eliminate our own properties from this. I want to go to his memo real quick. I would agree there is a challenge with the commercial industrial sites as 2 a suggests to be able to identify some of those. I wouldn't so far say let's eliminate that. There may be some really daunting challenges there that we don't want to go down. But there may be some opportunities and I think that's what my colleagues are looking for, is there an opportunity there. That, Jackie, you tried to highlight that as well. The challenges we might find there, but I think in order to find some compromise if we can keep some of our own city-owned sites, potentially we can also keep the opportunity alive looking for some commercial property in industrial sites.

>>> The last piece that I think I would struggle with to support the current motion would be 3-b 2, and this was in regards to i guess the description or definition around the homeless task force. I clearly do support that. In fact, have been working to pull something together now for a couple months as I denoted in my other memorandum. So, I support that. But to already
begin to set the parameters of what that looks like, who is invited, what we're talking about, in my mind, is premature. I think we need to be able to do one important thing out of this task force, which is collaborate a hill of a lot better because we have the water district hosting regional quarterly meetings. We have the county doing a task. We have public safety meeting with -- that's the one meeting i was on when this surfaced from our downtown Captain, Captain dwier, convening public safety officials downtown. There are a lot of efforts going on around how to address homelessness, but they're very disjointed. And I think we recognize that this isn't just a one park or one district issue. This is much bigger than that. And, so, we need to be working much more collaboratively. That I think is the initial goal that we should be looking for with this homeless task force that incorporates a place where we can actually make some decisions. And, so, that would be the only other follow-up. If you look at my memo, it talks about the model sort of being balanced off or based off of the mayor's gang prevention task force, which is a body of policy decision makers where we can make some of these decisions collaboratively amongst all the different entities. Should we have and could we have other specific neighborhood meetings on issues like bridge housing? Absolutely. Clearly, right? We need to have that. This task force is not the space for that. The idea of a task force is much more broad than that, much more high-level policy at where we need to be able to make decisions, not looking at one individual project or another. We need to do that. But I just think that that needs to be stated. It needs to be separate. The idea of the task force being something much bigger and much more collaborative. So, I don't know if my colleagues are comfortable with that, but I'm going to ask the maker of the motion, councilmember Jimenez, if you would be willing to find the compromise in regards to, one, not eliminating all vacant city-owned properties from the list. And then, two, I guess using the more light language -- and councilmember -- excuse me, councilmember Rocha's is not as descriptive as yours was. But just the efforts moving forward on the homeless task force being more in the direction that I provided in my memo and I'll ask Jackie before maybe you have a chance to respond. The reason why I had not reached out to you or I didn't go the route of trying to direct staff to do this or put it on priority setting is exactly because of this, the amount of work that you have in front of you already. If we try to task you with putting together this homeless task force, my guess was you were going to say that's something that would need to go to priority setting and that's going to take us some time. I instead took initiative and have already started working on that and want to be able to pull together the first meeting and be able to see where it goes from there. That was my reason for that. Maybe you can respond to at least this idea of the homeless task force and tell me if I'm wrong or right.
Well, you know, we certainly have a history of working on task forces and trying to get task forces engaged in addressing this issue. So, I think this would be the fourth or 5th task force that we’ve tried to pull together. And I appreciate you wanting to take the lead on it because you’re absolutely right, with all the work the department has right now, it would not be something we could take on. And I absolutely believe if we are going to make a difference, we need the policy makers who are going to come together and collaborate versus working on a staff level where I feel like we have had productive and good relationships with the other communities and the county and the housing authority which has led to us being able to achieve these 582 supportive housing units. So, from my perspective, I just think we have to be really clear what would be the goal of this task force. What would we want to achieve. Is this the right mechanism to do that. I know we have a conversation with Jennifer loving from destination home to have that conversation. That's what I would like to do to make sure, you know, it's going to be meaningful work and that would be able to push this effort county wide forward.

And if the direction were To move forward as stated in the memo in regards to asking your department to create the housing task force, what would your response be? If that was ultimately decided on today?

I would say that would be something we could not take on immediately. That the work load and the commitment just to move forward on the bridge communities is going to be time consuming. And we have the apartment rent ordinance that's coming forward. We have mobile home work. We have urban villages. We're looking at income source discrimination. Our plate would be full. We would not want to take on something that I didn't think we could do well, at least not in the near term.

So, I would say there's concurrence in what I was thinking. I understand there's been a number of task forces. The mayor's task force has been around for over two decades. It's not a temporary task force. I don't think we need another temporary type of task force for housing and homelessness. We need something permanent. We need that to go until we can actually end homelessness. [ APPLAUSE ]
>> Much like the, much like the mayor's gang prevention task force is still around because we're still trying to end gang violence and youth from even getting into gangs. It's an ongoing issue. So, but, again, I think it was a bit premature. I know I had brought it up in the last council meeting and did not intend to put it forward as a task for the homeless or the housing department. And, so, in my memory, on item 4.1, recommendation 2 denotes in regards to allowing my office to continue to try to not put that burden on the housing department to work with them. And we're taking on the burden right now of collaborating the policy makers and not, again, prescribing it to too much of a level. And if my colleagues feel differently, I'm perfectly comfortable with that and voicing it, but councilmember Jimenez, what's your response in regards to maybe an amendment to your motion?

>> So, with regard to the last prescriptive language on the task force, I think that's fine. I totally in agreement with that. And I would say with regard to you taking the lead, you can add my office's -- as an office that will help put that together and staffer it and provide some of the leg work to get that going. With regard to the -- to not eliminating the city-owned sites, right, is the other discussion. So, I have questions about that if I may. So, if we say, you know, approve the recommendation you're bringing forward and leave on there for consideration city-owned sites, does that bring us back up to those two or does that take us up to the 99? And what does the criteria play into that? How --

>> So, if we move back to the original criteria, we'd expand to the entire list of 99. In the mayor's memo, it talks about access and transit. We had originally said near transit. It modifies that a bit and says providing access. We eliminated a lot of the sites because of their rural nature and because they were moved from city centers and neighborhoods and residential areas. So, going back to a much broader list with open eyes and considering other opportunities, we would have more options to look at.

>> Okay. You just answered the other question I had, was wondering if you tweaked the criteria. If you see through a different lens, it would potentially open up other options and it seems like it would, right? And so I am supportive of that, opening it back up to public-owned land so that way we can fully consider the full list as we did from the beginning.

>> Okay. So, let me just be clear about the modification. Thank you, councilmember Jimenez. Is that okay with the seconder? Let me -- councilmember Rocha?
I don't know where to start because there's a lot of questions with that, mayor, which is -- so, we start with 99 and we work our way back Wards using the criteria you listed. And those criteria in the mayor's memo -- forgive me for going back and forth. So, now these would be the only criteria we would be using going forward?

I'm actually not the one making the motion.

Well, I think we're pointing to your -- that's the question I'm asking.

If we're Geneva Convention to incorporate those criteria, yes, it would broaden the number of sites, publicly-owned sites. I know we are considering various options around transportation that may not be connected to vta-run transit.

Let me get a little more detailed. Just these items in 6?

Referring to paragraph 6 of my memorandum or the memorandum --

Yes, number 6. So, these would be the only criteria now going forward?

Well, if that's what councilmember Jimenez is saying he's willing to adopt.

I guess I'm not sure, i guess, if I answered councilmember peralez's question what he thought with regard to the criteria. I guess the bottom line is I'm willing to modify the motion if it brings online all the sites and not just essentially the two district 2 sites.

Understood. I think that was -- I think that was the intent of councilmember peralez, is that right?

That is the intent.

Why don't we leave for secondary conversation the criteria. Let's come back to that. Let's first address the issue of the modification of paragraph 1. Checking with councilmember Rocha.
>> Paragraph 1 of whose memo?

>> Your memorandum.

>> Okay. Going back to mine.

>> The second amendment was to essentially, I think, delete paragraph 1. And the maker of the motion indicated he'd be willing to amend.

>> Well, mayor, that's the criteria, though. So, if you're asking me not to speak to the criteria but eliminate the criteria --

>> We can certainly talk about the criteria. It's not --

>> Is that what you asked me to do, is eliminate the criteria, but don't let me speak to the fact we're eliminating the criteria.

>> Paragraph 1 isn't the criteria. Paragraph 1 only has to do with the elimination of city-owned property.

>> Yeah, which we established through criteria, which is how we got down to 95.

>> Yes. And then the question is whether you broaden or narrow that criteria.

>> Which was taking me to the question I had on item number 6. Now that's going forward, the only criteria and we are no longer going to incorporate any of the criteria that city housing department provided for. That's the end result.

>> I believe this is a modest modification of the housing department criteria. I'll ask ray or Jackie to clarify.

>> So, it was -- so, the way I'm understanding the memo, there were two different criteria that the housing department established. So, the first one was just minimum site criteria. And my
understanding from reading the memo was that that was the modification of the minimum. But I think what's not clear is the additional site criteria that we came back out with after our public process.

>> Yes, that's exactly what I'm trying to understand. Is that no longer on the table? And that's what councilmember peralez is asking for, right?

>> Yeah, I would say initially i would be asking that we're not eliminating all the city-owned properties as a -- and then remain with item 1, recommendation 1 from the joint memo that I signed that states the initial goal, which was identifying the goal to hit one in every council district. Criteria wise, we did make some recommendations in item 6. I'm willing to hear if there's other restrictions or input that my colleagues have in that regard. I'm not, by any means, saying we have that perfect.

>> Nor am I. I'm just trying to get clarity on what you're asking me to change.

>> Let me offer a path for simplification here. The proposed modification is eliminate paragraph 1. If you decide after you hear that changes in criteria are not satisfactory, you're certainly free to withdraw your support for that modification. But I think we need to at least get over the first step first which is whether publicly owned sites, public sites are going to be on the table.

>> How are we going to revisit -- it's clear what you're telling me the criteria is.

>> I'm not the maker of the motion. Councilmember --

>> You're asking our motion to be modified. So, I know you're pointing to sergio, but what are you asking this motion to be modified to reflect?

>> Again, councilmember peralez is asking for the modification. And councilmember Jimenez said he's willing to accept A friendly amendment to eliminate paragraph 1.
I'm following all that. So now councilmember Peralez just clarified, yes, it would eliminate the housing department's new established criteria after the public outreach. That what you're asking for, councilmember Peralez?

It would -- we would have to revise it. So, there is a suggestion which in the memo I cosigned that talks about how to revise it. I know your memorandum did not suggest any revision to the criteria because your suggestion was just to eliminate all city-owned sites. So, your criteria would only be applied to Non-city-Owned sites. If we bring back the city-owned sites, there is some language that I'm willing to say that would be the criteria I'm comfortable with, which is item 6 in the memo that I signed. But, yes, that would now modify the most current criteria that the housing department has put forward that has now narrowed us down to two sites. Clearly if we modify that, we would be stuck with the two sites. We have to modify that to open it back up.

We don't have to.

We have to in order to increase it from the two sites to something higher, so.

Got it.

So, I'm looking at -- so this takes me to -- I've got about three hours of notes here to ask questions. I'm not going to go into those. But what this takes me to is I thought the criteria established by the housing department was pretty reasonable. 150 feet from schools and every parks. 150 feet from corridor. 150 feet from residential uses. I'm looking at all the other setbacks we have for city uses in San José. We have a thousand from schools and parks for medicinal marijuana collectives. We have 200 feet for drive-through fast food. We have 200 feet for bail bonds. We have 500 feet from night clubs and bars. We have 150 feet from outdoor vending. We have 300 feet from 24-hour use. These all land underneath that. So, for me I'm looking at these distances, don't seem actually that far. So, why am I going to throw these out on a good policy basis? I appreciate the intent here. Let me say with my first line in my notes, I agreed with actually everything the mayor said tonight, everything. And I have agreed with everything you said tonight, maybe something on the task force, but honestly that's not a priority to me. So I'm with you guys completely 100%. But to just throw these out, which as I just listed, are pretty darn short comparatively speaking to a lot of other things we
do. I don't know why we're doing that and what the basis is for that except just to make the case we're going to put them all back on because. And I completely agree with the mayor's point as I said on all these, it is disingenuous to say we're going to take these sites off the table and public agencies and do it completely on yours. Completely agree. I'm left with a political situation which you saw I'm on not a memo with my colleagues. I started with the place of leaving the remaining sites on, last four, whatever the case may be, but I also appreciate they aren't in my district. So, it was hard to find some consensus on this issue, as you appreciate. I got 13 out of 15 recommendations combined from all of them and only missed on two with some modifications you're suggesting. There's my long diatribe of why I'm struggling to why understand why I'm throwing these all out except to throw them all out and start over. And what is the process for establishing these new criteria? Those are just my questions I'm left with.

>> Okay. So, did you want -- [ APPLAUSE ]

>> The maker of the motion to answer the question? I'm trying to figure out who you'd like to answer the questions.

>> If I can just ask the housing a question, I think this may help clear things up to a certain extent.

>> Okay.

>> I think it may. It macon fuse things a little bit more. Let's just assume we go with the criteria that you're recommending on this current memo, right, that leaves us with effectively two sites.

>> It was actually three.

>> Three sites.

>> Correct.

>> So, three sites.
Three sites.

But what if we then include the criteria, access to transit or commitment from another agency to provide transportation, how many other sites would that open up?

Well, we're looking at the list right now. There are sites in district 2 that could be opened up. And there are --

Because I guess I'm wondering, I don't know if we need to go all the way back to the original, original --

There would be two council districts it would open up to. So, council district number 2 and number 8 where we have identified the reason they were eliminated was because of their distance from transit.

Okay. [LAUGHTER]

There's clarity. Just lost two votes. [LAUGHTER]

I mean, listen, I hope you all can appreciate -- I think we all -- we're all smart people. We can appreciate the fact that first quarter earnings conference call I haven't -- yeah, actually I'd rather not say. [LAUGHTER]

So, yeah, I mean, if we can go to that at the very least, but I would prefer to go back to the full list. I think it's the, it's the, you know, I don't know, I think it's the -- I don't want to use the word fair, but we are in a predicament that I'm not quite sure how to move forward and get out of to be very honest with you. And certainly I represent my residents. I don't agree with everything they say and I want to do what's right for folks that are living on the streets as well as my residents. And I don't see a very logical way out of this.

Okay. I'm going to take what you said as a rejection of the friendly amendment for now. I know councilmember peralez had the mic so I'm going to give it back to him and perhaps there may be a different friendly amendment he can offer.
Thank you. It sounds like there is just really now maybe we're down to one conflict. Otherwise I think there's maybe some consensus here. I'll see maybe, housing if you can help us out. If the goal were to be, as in the memo I cosigned, to go back and try and hit a goal of one in every council district, would we have to eliminate all of your new criteria and go back up to 99? Or do you think there is some middle ground there where you can add in some additional criteria? And maybe we're not going all the way up to 99, but we're getting to a point where we can still be able to at least have the opportunity to have one in every district. Clearly having to modify your latest criteria, because your latest criteria narrows it down to two.

Three.

Three, apologize.

I mean, I think we'd have to eliminate some of the new criteria, right? We'd have to eliminate the residential and the environmental in the park. We just have to eliminate it, right? We'd have to re-look at the sites again. The question would be how do we establish or do we establish any other baseline.

And I think we have to, as a council today, sort of make a decision one way or the other if we really want to pursue bridge housing communities or not. Because if we do, then I think the only way that we can move forward where we can actually have control of the decisions is to go back to eliminating this additional criteria, having the goal of one in every council district whether we get there or not, but opening up that opportunity because clearly what the criteria that we have now is not allowing us that opportunity to do it. And clearly the current motion by eliminating all city-owned sites completely takes us out of that equation and we're asking our partner agencies to find the locations. If that were the case, I would say, so if the motion that is currently on the table were to pass, I'd say we effectively, then, must just say we're not pursuing bridge housing communities. We're asking our partner agencies to do so. And we might as well focus on something else. And if that's what the council wants to do, fine. But we should be clear about it. That we're asking our partner agencies to find those locations and we'll help them through it. But we're not finding our own and we're not building our own in our own city-owned land. I still would like to get there. And again, we may not get to 10. We may not get to one in every single council district. But if we're not going to move in that direction,
then, again, I think it needs to be clear. So, if we're still difference of opinion on this, it sounded like, mayor, councilmember Jimenez was comfortable with eliminating the criteria and at least allowing the opportunity for us to try to get one in every council district on city-owned property. It sounded like you were comfortable with that, councilmember Jimenez. If not I can make a --

>> We have a seconder.

>> I can make a substitute motion which effectively would be similar to the motion that we have on the table with the amendment that I had asked for about the homeless task force, eliminating recommendation 1 from councilmember Rocha's memo, inserting recommendation 1 from the memo I cosigned. And incorporating the other missing parts of our memo which would include number 6, which talks about the -- or excuse me, number 5. No, number 6, which is the criteria. So, would add to it some of that criteria descriptions. That's the motion.

>> Okay. So, all right. That was councilmember who seconded. Let me clarify the substitute motion. Councilmember Rocha's memo minus paragraph 1 of that memo and with a modification to paragraph 3-B-2 to conform with the homeless task force that's articulated in councilmember peralez's memorandum, is that right?

>> Yes by eliminating recommendation 1 replacing it with our recommendation number 1, I think we'd also have to add in our memo because our memo does specify some new criteria.

>> Right. And so then I'm adding, then, and -- and the motion includes paragraphs 1 and 6 from the memorandum signed by the five of us.

>> Correct.

>> So, everybody is clear about what the motion is at this point?

>> What was that last statement you said, 1 and 6, I'm sorry?

>> Paragraphs 1 and 6 from the memorandum the five of US Signed.
What does that do? I'm sorry. Inserts those two or returns those two?

So, maintain the original council direction identifying potential sites in every district.

Okay.

Doesn't mean that's where the actual sites will be, potential sites. Paragraph 6 is the criteria.

Got it, thank you.

Okay. So, for those keeping score at home, that's what we got. All right. Councilmember Tim Nguyen.

We start again, I would appreciate that. So, out of the four issues you identified through the presentation, the proximity, the structure, the safety and property value, so forth, those are great. But if you were to listen more and allow me to share, I thought from the experience of people who went to Seattle, I went to Portland. I spent the night with the Portland -- the homeless encampment and learned another great thing. That I think we should be able to help make -- we want those homeless people to earn their spot on a reward basis, which is they've got to be motivated. They've got to lift themselves up and work their way up to be -- to earn a good spot. That would help you in the process of screening. That would earn the committee trust, that you would have people who will become a good neighbor instead of a problem because you must admit out of 7,000 out of 4,000, we cannot -- I don't think we can ever accommodate and please them all. So, at this rate we help very few of them anyway. So, that few we go, we go as low as we can. We will work and help those who want to help themselves. And help those who want to help themselves. Who want to make our job easier. That's the part I want to add. As -- as to the criteria that you add, 100 feet from the residence, 100 feet from the creeks, 150 feet from the school and park and so on, so forth. That's after listening to people. Then I would like to recommend you for, for your comments you just made recently, that you admit there's no way that bypassing the community outreach, we should have done more with listening to people. What would the idea -- do it without community outreach is horrible. And that is a very -- and people get misinformation. I would like us to be consistent not on this but when we deal with providing solution to homeless people or any
other matter, we want to be fair to the community, we want to be fair to the taxpayer who pay their taxes and they feel they're being threatened. I'm talking about another big project. The good we did but did we fail. We are inconsistent from the criteria. Later on I don't want to take time but I will follow up to work with you and the community to make sure we are fair to them too. So let's go back and summarize on what we have in hand. I would appreciate in fact Raul -- I'm glad we did that. We don't want to be inconsistent. We want to go back and open the options. I really would like to -- I'd like, ray, for your comments on that. You reach out to the county but so far we haven't gotten any commitment from them. We are one city but it's not fair. The county's 7 million people. We're only a big part of it but why only we here do the issue. Action friendly or whatever necessary. You know better than I do. But bring them to the table. Bring the county. To the table. So we will have access. I'm glad we hopefully see something at the end. I will trust that we will together work with you and make sure that you have one small pilot so at least we do some good and earn the trust for the community and we go from there. It is a long and tough case. At this rate to find the proper location it would take a long time. But if we stick together with the support with your staff and with the community cooperation we're then going to make it. So with that I thank you and wish you best of luck and thank you, council for your hard work too.

>> Thank you. Council member Rocha?

>> Thank you, mayor. The good news is I got to see already a couple of my comments. The bad news is I have a lot more. So if I may, and I don't know who to pose this to. I was getting trouble getting an answer in terms of the memorandum that was signed by Liccardo Carrasco Jones and Moreno. Who should I pose a question to to get some clarity on an item? You or --

>> Happy to respond. If not on a memorandum then a motion you make.

>> Got it. So on this criteria. It says revise the criteria for the potential sites to the following. It doesn't say that any site's going to be eliminated or ranked and maybe I missed it if it's in the body of the memo. But what does this mean? We do eliminate sites? We don't eliminate sites? Is there a points system? I'm trying to get an understanding --
Clearly a site would be eliminated if they did not have ready access to utilities, did not have at least the developable site or at least half an acre. And also if they don't either have transit or a commitment from another agency to provide transportation.

So ready access, meaning it's not already on site.

Ready to access to utilities. Meaning we're not going to go spend six figures to --

Cut a trench and line it up. Got it.

On the first one access, access can mean a number of things, half a block, six blocks.

Usually a quarter mile.

We're looking at doing that a half mile transit would provide opportunities.

Thank you.

And then let me pose a question just in terms of your philosophy around why you eliminated the criteria the housing department recommended. I appreciate it's in the interest of getting more sites. But from your point of view you don't feel any setback then is necessary in terms of --

No.

-- preparing?

Setbacks may be very appropriate.

It's important first to recognize -- I cut you off. I'm sorry.

No, I cut you off. Go ahead.
Context is really important. Not every park is the same. I think we could clearly identify very large parks where we would think it would be quite appropriate to have a site where you wouldn't have concerns, for example, being close to a children's playground. We can also imagine very dense housing that's a very residential neighborhood where it would be quite appropriate because in fact right now we have somebody spending $300 million to build a high-rise right next to one of our homeless sites at the plaza hotel. Not all residential sites are created equal. Not all parks are created equal. I think it's important for us to look at them, vet them publicly. It's not like any of this is going to be obscure to anybody. It's going to be very clear where the sites are. And those very issues that are raised by the community I think will be very transparent to anyone.

So then we wouldn't establish any setbacks for parks and for school or residential.

I don't have any problem with setbacks as basic guideline. I just imagine we could all think of exceptions where we say hey, setback doesn't make sense there, plaza hotel's right next to a high-rise, who cares? So I'm quite open to having it as a guideline.

But the repairing one is one we're bound to follow, right?

It's a current council policy.

It's gold.

I don't know. Jackie, you want to comment any further?

Well, we do have to do the sequa. That is one of the requirements that was left by the state. We have to have an environmental review.

You've been pretty clear, though, in many ways, environmentally, that you have no interest in developing within the repairing --

Yes, except we currently have an exception for example downtown highly urban areas where we have a smaller setback. So again -- and we could think of water district land, again, where we might say, well, it's in a really urbanized area where we allow for exclusions of that
policy. I guess what I'm saying is there's good rationale behind all these setbacks. I think it's sensible as a guideline. But there's exceptions where we probably all say no need for it.

>> Thank you. It sounds wiggly and open and gray. Fair enough. As I said, content is important.

>> You just characterized it as something that's not the same as being fair. Let me say exactly what it is. It clearly excludes the items that are identified and the negative under paragraph 6. And I have no objection at all to a guideline that says you're going to have this setback from residential or park or otherwise. I think, though, if we look carefully at these sites, you and others in the community will see sites where you say that guideline, there's a reason for an exception in this case.

>> Guarantee that?

>> I am quite certain.

>> I am always careful when I guarantee things that I'm not completely certain of. So on the implementation of these. So when we establish these new ones and these sites come back in the ranking, the council action as you folks had listed comes back for to us approve one more time or just take a look at the new sites. And forgive me again if I missed it in terms of how many -- were you looking at a pilot to start with -- I can't recall.

>> The memorandum I co-signed instructs that the city manager would identify no more than three. I believe that's in the -- I'm not sure if that got changed with the subsequent iterations, looking at it now, because I know it's been changed several times.

>> Yes. Here we go. Paragraph 5. Three or fewer sites to establish proof of concept. It could be one, it could be two, it could be three. It's going to depend on how painful is this? If we identify one or two, that's great.

>> If we're looking at a list of 99, I'll just take it down to half. Is there a ranking order that they're going to establish are the ones that score highest on your number 6?
>> Yes. That is dealt with in paragraph --

>> Forgive me, mayor, if this stuff's clear. I've read so many documents.

>> We got too many memos. But I think clearly -- yes. Paragraph 4A, prioritize the sites in order of viability for readiness and development.

>> Viability would include the constraints we apply today, which could be developed. Obviously, you may identify a site in every district but it could be so far down the list it's not going to be developed at all or not for a couple of years.

>> In order of viability and readiness using these items.

>> Using these criteria and any other criteria this council establishes.

>> But we don't have any other than the ones here at this point.

>> Yes. As I say, I welcome guidelines if you want --

>> I was using stats. But I understand. So I'll skill now to a couple other questions I have for staff.

>> Could I clarify the motion? Because the memo we signed is not what I moved. What the mayor was describing as far as that particular item, I'll go to the exact number if my iPad will come up.

>> The question was about the memorandum. That's why I answered the question about the memorandum.

>> Yeah.

>> Again, I don't answer questions about motions I don't make.
Got it. What was actually moved was council member Rocha's memo. The item that you were talking about right now was number 5 from the memo we signed. I did not move that but it already is incorporated in council member Rocha's memo. So in fact it's part of your memo. So it would be your language, actually, council member Rocha, which mentions it which says as recommended in recommendations 4 and 5 in the memo from the mayor and vice mayor it's your number 3 that talks about --

Your recommendation.

Yeah. Which talks about three or fewer sites. Anyways, that's what I'm saying. You already added it in your memo, which is what I moved.

I'm well aware of that. I'm trying to understand what you meant in your recommendation as we're going forward if that's the direction now. A little deeper than what's listed in the two or three sentences.

Thank you for the clarification.

Where are my notes here? From questions for staff. As I mentioned early in the conversation, I generally agree with everything the mayor offered up at least in these two initial comments. The likelihood of us getting responses from public agencies has been pretty limited so far. And we've already had conversations. So if I could ask, how long have those conversations been going on for potential uses of their sites for whatever of the different items we've talked about in the toolbox from the past number of years since I've been on this council? So how long have we been approaching them, and how little response we've been getting. So please, if you wouldn't mind.

We did originally approach the county on some very high-profile sites that we thought were obvious. So obviously it was the fairgrounds, and they rejected that. And the old city hall. Because we thought perhaps we could do something with that building and that was not determined viable. We have been talking to them about a year, I would say, whenever the bridge communities first came out. We immediately approached them. And we've had conversations with the water district. But it was more recent when ray met with them that they in fact said they were very interested now in working with us to identify a site. So we do
believe the water district is working hard to identify sites and that they have a shared goal and a shared vision, and Ray is refusing to go to any more of their meetings until they offer up the site. So we believe we will get some sites from the water district.

>> Now, thank you. But we've been talking to the question for years, I'm assuming. Not just months on the use of their sites for a number of different uses.

>> We have. But I do think that they're -- that the staff is now motivated by the board who would like to do something very specific to this topic.

>> That's good news. A step further, with the passage of measure a, I'm assuming the county, if they had sites where they're willing or interested in which so far they've offered us none in the past years.

>> That would be correct. But I also think they're very motivated. They should be motivated because we have six -- if you count ours plus the number of sites they're working on we have an extensive pipeline where we're going to have to fill with people in a short amount of time. So the staff sees a need to have these short-term solutions because it's getting people ready to move into their permanent sites. So I think they realize the need and the benefit they would have if we started housing people now.

>> You don't think their interest would be more for measure a projects?

>> Well, I think again that we have such a large pipeline of projects that are going to open at the same time including theirs in San José that I think they realize there's a benefit to have identifying people now that are going to go into those sites. I think they see it as a benefit. So I think there's interest on the staff level. It's just, again, they have limited holdings in the city. But I think they're interested in having another conversation again.

>> Let me again -- I support the bridge housing concept as a tool in our toolbox. I wish I shared your optimism. I've been one that's hoping for these things. But with all due respect I was on the housing task force that the county established. I don't even remember how many years ago. And some of these items are listed in here. So I appreciate your optimism today, but we've been talking about that optimism for years. Years. And you're standing here now or
sitting here now saying you think they're all of a sudden going to offer us up some sites. We're optimistic. And so is the water district. That's great news. I wish I shared your optimism. I don't because we've been hearing a lot of that for quite a number of years. And I hope all of that's changed, and I hope I'm completely wrong in my pessimism.

>> Could I insert just a suggestion? Because I think you raise a really good point. If the maker of the motion were to include authorization for the entire council to sign a letter to each of the boards of these organizations, nothing motivates because this conversation's all been happening from staff to staff. And it does change when you get a call from the board member, the supervisor. Would you be supportive of that?

>> I understand. Of course. Absolutely.

>> Council member cross, would you be supportive of that in front of the amendment?

>> Absolutely.

>> Okay.

>> Thank you.

>> And council member Nguyen.

>> Yes.

>> Your mike's off.

>> I'm sorry. Those would be the only two public entities that we had any optimism. The other public entities that have land. We have not made any kind of inroads with those entities.

>> Thank you very much. I was going somewhere with this. Sidetracked. So on the private property ones, the leases, and you talked a little about that. Actually, let me jump back. On the bridge housing item, the direction from council to proceed on this was how long ago? Originally.
Council originally gave us direction to move forward with maybe 2176 of the June 28th, 2016 council meeting. That was bridge housing, pursue the legislation. If the legislation passes move forward with a plan.

2016.

June 20th, yes.

So if we proceed tonight with the direction you get and as we pointed out or you pointed out your heavy workload, and you've talked about this I think in a community meeting, what is the earliest in a perfect world we could go through the process you laid out tonight, the community process, the sequa process, and have these units on a site?

I think --

We're on tape and you'll remember this.

Certainly, council member. I think there are some variables even in the proposed --

Ooh, good answer. Way to start it. I'm teasing you.

It depends -- a lot of this depends on the outreach process that council really wants because the current recommendation as I understand it has us returning with a comprehensive timeline and outreach plan. Depending on the level of outreach that's required it could delay. I certainly could see a project in 2018. I certainly could. That was the original goal. The original focus of this work quasi-to try to do something immediately, which is a word I'm not going to use anymore.

When in 2018? January 2018 or December of 2018?

No, I think closer to the end of 2018.

So we're limited for how long? The end of 2021?
The bill sunsets in 2022.

I'm assuming that's December then.

December of '22.

So it's December of '22. Got it. So we're hopeful that in a year and a half maybe that we might be able to get a year, maybe less. Year and a half. Got it. Thank you. And that's the perfect world. And we think all three of these could be up and running. Or just one of them?

I think it really depends on the program's design.

All right. Fair enough.

Because it's all tied to costs.

I appreciate that.

So when we come back and we would describe here's the different variables, we have priced out the most expensive option. But as other both council members have spoken to it and the audience members have spoken to it, there are other successful communities that are more residential -- resident-based. We have this very highly professional model that we have costed out. It could be less. If we decided on another approach.

And the money set aside, the funds set aside for this is how much?

Council member, we have approximately $2.4 million set aside through the budget message.

And there's a million and four to get one up and running? It was 600 -- 500, 300, and 600.
Depending on the level of staffing and security, we're still waiting on the costs of the final designs of these. As I mentioned, there's a lot of variables. So we could control the cost of both operations and development depending on how much we want to do it at each site.

That's how I did the math. 600, 300, and a $500 cost. About a million four to get it up and running.

With the current model.

I should make a correction. The law sunsets in January of 2022, not December.

Got it. Thank you very much. You talked about your staff workload. But you're comfortable you can get this up and running and get one unit, or one site up by that timeline, and then we're going to be running for the other two, with thoughts not set aside yet. With the sunsetting and the amount it takes to get one up and running. The reason I'm going down this line of questioning is because of a point council member Pirella's made. We've gotten more engaged in this issue as a council and our community. I think that's a question I was interested in having asked before I went any further in any direction. I'm not so sure this is. I'm looking at the time this is going to take to get up and running. 500,000 every year after. And the timeline that we're up against when this legislation sunsets and I'm not so sure I'm comfortable with this direction given -- are we getting a good return on this investment? Are there better ways to spend these dollars to help the folks that are going to be sleeping in the gutters and sleeping in the creeks? [Applause] For this winter. As we're taking our time, as we should, going through this process, we're going to miss a whole other winter. And could these dollars be spent in a better way to help folks in another different way in terms of all the different tools we use before the weather hits and these folks are out in the cold and exposed. That's a question that I wanted to ask in the 60 days, which is why I made that recommendation, because if this is the best use of our dollars and there is no other path to spend these dollars in a way that's going to be more effective than 20 people in a year and a half, I think I could do better than a 20 people in a year and a half. Than the time and resources it's going to take and the heartache we're going to go through in terms of our engagement and this council's discussion. [Applause] And I don't mean to put you on the spot. But let me ask you a question. We've looked at some of these -- I saw on the slide that the best way forward is prevention from homeless in the first place. And we have rental
assistant programs. And I think it was 700,000 or something set aside. And eliminating someone from being homeless in the first place is the best way to not have to spend larger dollars down the road. Those 2.4, or how much you said set aside already, has been set aside for a while now. How long? Or is that just in the recent budget?

>> That was completed in the recent budget.

>> Those are going to be sitting there unspent for potentially a year. And could those dollars be better used to help folks on the front end and just an example which is why I was looking for a professional opinion on this, which is why I asked you guys to come back and have a report. I don't to put you on the spot. But that's the question I'm left with and it's hard for me to go forward not answering that question first before we make this major investment.

>> That's why I appreciate that 60-day time frame that you've given us, because I think is we have explored other options. One of them is the hotel option, which I think if we could find a viable hotel we've heard that there are a couple that are available and we have not been able to determine the price and the amount of work we would need to do in order to get those up and running. But I think giving us the additional time with the time frame of the 60 days we would know the answer of what's available out in the community that we haven't had a chance to explore and we'd look at the rapid rehousing dollars as well. How much does it cost with the 2.4, how many people would we be able to house for a period of time?

>> So the answer is you're interested in that question yourself. And given all the other projects that we are working on and the potential to house people as quickly as possible. I mean, the challenge has been how can we house people as quickly as possible. I think this whole idea was could we create something at least on a model that would be cheaper for us to produce? We don't have the housing type yet. To see the prototype and its cost and could we produce it quickly I think is one key element that we have yet to have answered.

>> Thank you.

>> I'm just not in your department. I am not a professional by any means. My gut based upon my experience is that this may not be the best investment in terms of the time and the effort and the return if it is just 15 to 25 individuals in a year and a half that these dollars might be
better spent in another way. I am really interested in that conversation with all the information from you folks providing it. I have a question for the city manager. I appreciate the comments made in terms of his interest in the task force and appreciating staff's time commitment already. If the council gave you direction to put a task force together and your housing department was stretched I'm pretty familiar with this, you have dollars set aside in your office that you have spent to facilitate a task force and have it staffed or outside staffed. So if you got direction to establish a task force would you be able to do that without using housing department staff? I would have to look at that. If we are going to have a task force on housing not having the housing office involved is a concern to me. I understand the question. We would have to take a look at that and see what that would look like. Having a task force where I don't see the housing department engaged I think is --

>> I'm sure they would attend.

>> You can set up a task force through a different process or different staff.

>> So the model has been done before. The question I am concerned about you think you listed you have been working on this for some time. I don't think you had one meeting yet. It has been almost half a year. Is this march? The sense of urgency we haven't had one meeting. For me having city staff and the funds behind it and the opportunity behind it if you had meetings I am happy to kick in money and help you. I have been sitting on this council for seven years and have been talking about a lot of things that we haven't been able to do not for lack of effort but for lack of capacity. That's why I was posing the question. These things take a long time. This was my concern with the approach is we are not going to do a dam thing to help one person potentially until December of 2018. We have seen the numbers and we saw at the beginning of the presentation the need is now. I have two more questions and you raised it already around hotel/motel conversion. Thank you. This notion that all districts participate, it's not one that I don't disagree with. Overconcentration is extremely important. But we are not going to get there because if we are just going to go with potentially three pilots and running up against a wall of sunset of the legislation and lack of funding beyond this I don't think it really matters that we are going to try to say out loud that we want all districts to participate if we are only going to do three and can't get one up until then. I guess I will leave that item alone. I have strong thoughts about that statement. I don't think it really applies. A council district boundary is really arbitrary and they so if there is available land then there is
available land if not then there is not. I will leave it there. I don't believe I will be supporting the motion as it stands. I'm not convinced that this is the right approach. I appreciate my colleagues on this. As I mentioned I have agreed with every issue raised. I don't have disagreement but I think eliminating this criteria and proceeding along this path without knowing whether or not we should be spending dollars in this way is not something I can support. [ Applause ]

>> Thank you, mayor. So if you're in Santa Clara and watching this, this discussion is your best argument against district voting. Hello to the new faces who have come out for this issue. I represent district four. Landiep, I will perhaps be on the ballot next in 2018. Do with that what you would like. I have not voiced my opinion on this matter publically yet. I have a flare for the dramatic. Let me see if I give my opinion and weigh in on this if we can get to six votes somehow and end this sooner than later. I have some questions. To the housing department, I appreciate your work on this and it was said you probably have the toughest job in all of city hall. Definitely a tough one. I know you are under staffed and trying to tackle a tough problem. I appreciate that. The way that this was rolled out -- I won't rehash it -- but it was problematic. Not in the way that it made a community upset. What I'm seeing is we put out a proposal or housing department put out a proposal for ten sites across all districts. And, you know, I was -- the council acts as one independent of how I may feel personally. If the council votes on it I'm on board.

>> And they felt we were trying to pull a fast one. I hear the department coming back and saying even if we did ten sites we wouldn't have the capacity, our program partners couldn't staff it. So I guess in my mind even if the community did not have an issue with what we proposed, they are like let's do it and for housing that would come back and say wait a minute, if we move forward with ten sites we are short. Let's go down to two or three. That to me is disappointing because I'm not a housing expert. I rely on city staff to be my residential housing, planning. I may not always agree. My startling point is what you guys educate me on. I get my own view points and hash out my opinion. I put that out there as this kind of to let it hang because I feel that I was willing to go to bat for something. And now even if I were to stand firm and say let's do ten sites across San José staff is going back to saying ten sites isn't viable at this particular point because of resources.
I want to be clear. The council decided. The staff never said we are recommending you do ten sites. We have all the resources. Just to clarify, that decision was made by the previous council who was trying to take a stand that everyone should play a role in providing housing for the homeless. That was made one night in a decision without any discussion on do we have the staff, the time, the money? Can we do it fast? So it started from that process. We were trying to take that direction and understanding the cost. We had to do an rfp, select somebody, begin to have discussions with them. It is an iterative process of which we are learning from. That is part of the process of trying something different and new and potentially could be innovative is we have to learn through this piece.

I appreciate that. I came in in between the last council and this council. It was like there is this memo coming out. I withdraw that. That's how I'm kind of navigating this as a council member. I'm just curious how did -- we have ten sites where the only criteria was 99 sites with city owned property and then we had community input and critiques and then we added the 100 foot and 150 foot setback. Can you explain why it was 100 and 150?

Listening to concerns and trying to look at similar uses. We don't have a use exactly like this in the city. We are trying to see what similar uses existed. The right pairing setback was part of our pairing policy. The 100 foot seemed reasonable and in line with what environmental advocates were concerned about. The 100 foot setbacks were similar to the incidental use shelter ordinance that we passed. We are trying to look at some balance not entirely understanding the impact of the site and understanding what it would do to traffic and what it could do to noise but use similar programs as sort of a guide. I maybe understand this. What does ab 2176 do for San José that we would not be able to do without it?

Ab 2176. It amends the shelter crisis act which allows jurisdiction to declare a shelter crisis and have certain relieves. What it does in our case is it allows us to adopt our own building code in Lieu of the state code. Our own fire and safety. It relieves us from some liability issues with regards to tenant and landlord and it allows us to override existing zoning and land use issues. We can use an industrial site and open space and residential for the purpose of this emergency housing.

It sun sets in January 2022.
>> Yes, sir.

>> So the clock is ticking on that. The five year doesn't start when we start breaking down. We make use of the exception that we have as a city.

>> That is correct.

>> I'm curious if the tiny homes has been envisioned. I know the architecture firm is volunteering their time. Out of curiosity is there a more cost effective -- by your math I think it works out to $15,000 per tiny home. Is that right?

>> Initial estimate.

>> If we just had container apartments or trailers, have you worked out those costs?

>> We have looked at a wide range of options, everything from rvs to tough sheds. We have looked at different costs. Ab 2176 does have a basic framework for what is required that is a hard walled building. It does have lighting. It does have some basic insulation. Based on what ab 2176 allows us for with minimum standards this is probably most cost effective route under that law.

>> Assuming that we got land from partner agencies like water district what would be that arrangement that allows us to exert control? Would we have to have like an intermediateary?

>> It allows to city owned or city leased land. We would need to lease that land from a partner agency.

>> Do you have a sense of whether it is market rate or because we are agencies --

>> Ideal goal would be if we are leasing it from a partner agency trying to accomplish the same goals the cost would be as low as possible.

>> Sites of 25 versus 50 or 100 or 30 --
There is. I mean, we were looking at a couple of different factors with new programs. We always try and see because we don't necessarily know. We know what affordable housing is going to look like. There are lots of different examples from around the country. Bridge housing is a new model. We have seen other sites operated. Typically the numbers range from 10 or 15 to 25 or 30 or 40. 20 is sort of that bare core minimum where we could have services and have funded services for those 20 individuals. We usually have a 1 to 20 case management ratio. It looked like a number we could look at.

So what happens if the pilot is successful?

So if the pilot is successful it provides us with a bridge for individuals and gets them immediately off the street and depends on how you define success. If you can have an extremely low cost option where you can quickly put it together and get people off the streets and have them be ready for housing the moment it becomes available then it is a model that can be replicated in other places in the country.

I guess what I mean is as a council member going out to my community saying the city wants us to do this thing called bridge housing tiny homes we are enabled to do so because we have state permission. We have this window to do it. Let's not waste time. Let's get to it. But it is going to sunset in five years. After that we are going to break it down. They say to me if it works we are going to make it permanent. You are going to pull a fast one on me. If it is successful in the sense that it houses people what is the intention after that?

So clearly the law sun sets and I think the question would be would the city have any interest, would the state have interest in extending it. We would not pursue that unless these were successful, successful with the definition of the neighborhood as well. Successful couldn't just be people graduated and moved on to housing. We would want to demonstrate that crime had not gone up, there had not been drops in property values and all the things that people have feared. We would want to understand did that come true or not.

Council member, the reason that the state allowed us to move forward with this is because we call it bridge housing for a reason. We have 500 plus units that are in our development pipeline and we have thousands of people out on the streets. The goal was that perhaps this could provide a bridge to get to that development pipeline when we begin to get into this role.
and with measure a beginning to move we will have more houses developed. The reason the state did buy into this is because we said we have this big, big pipeline of permanent housing. We just need to get there and people are suffering in the interim.

>> Thank you. That's all my questions. Just some comments. I think where I come down on this is that we have this exception from the state. It is such a waste to not use it because we are San José and we are supposed to be the city that is innovative and can do all of this next generation stuff. We should be able to house people. The more we discuss this we are kind of losing time on it. It would be different if we were just discussing this from square one. The fact that we have this in place I see no reason to not make good use of it. There are issues and concerns very valid concerns from my residents and residents across the city. I echo council member Rocha's comments that it is completely arbitrary to do this per district because the district lines are just arbitrary themselves. I support this notion of sharing the difficulty or sharing the burden across each district, but that to me is backwards as a process matter. What we need to do if we are trying to help people house people and build communities that make sense is to come up with site criteria beginning and see like where we get experts together, housing advocates together. What makes sense? It can't just be city-owned land and there is your site. It has to be 150 feet away from our corridor, maybe not too close to schools, close to transit within a mile walk or half a mile walk, maybe close to a convenience store where you are not in a food desert. Whatever criteria we want to come up with and then go to the list of 99 sites and we cut it according to that criteria and let it fall where it may. If we say every district has to have one and I think I heard district 9 only has one site. That is not really a choice for district 9. District 4 I only have two sites. There has been community outcry there, too. I am willing as the council member to bring some of this to district 4. I would welcome it. You are not giving me a lot to work with when I only have one or two sites.

>> Maybe there is some misunderstanding here. I don't think anybody is saying we are going to build on ten sites in the next year. I don't think that is the intent of memoranda or staff. Staff doesn't have the capacity.

>> Assuming we did that would be the share of the responsibility? The share of the responsibility would -- the one site district nine would be built out?
In that imaginary world, staff is still prioritizing sites. If they decide the only site available in district four is far inferior to ten other sites to identify I'm venturing to guess would go that way. At he is one site is something that every council member is willing to stand up for and say we are willing to knowing quite well that it's likely -- first of all we know as a certainty we are only able to start with a small number, one, two or three. And secondly, the reality of affordable housing siting, particularly homeless siting has been very geographically concentrated in the city. District three, parts of district six, parts of district seven and pretty much that is where homeless housing goes. And it's I think a reality that every district is seeing the homeless crisis on their front door step. And so therefore it should be -- I know that sounds like a defense to arbitrariness. I think when you agree to work this out at the end you don't end up with a site in every district and you don't end up with inadequate sites being built on when better sites are not being built on.

I think I would add to this set of criteria that we don't build near impacted tracks. It's the study where it is high concentrated. We don't want to concentrate more in that area. I guess I know there is a substitute motion on the table. To know and start planning votes here is where I am at. I am willing to support the mayor's memo with council member Peralez and everyone else signed on with friendly amendments. Here is what I am looking at. See if people can live with that. I would like to clarify that the goal of the project is to house 250 people and that may take different forms. It may be one in every district which is ideal. It may be one site with 50 in a place that makes sense or one site with ten. We plan it in a way that makes sense for organic growth in the city and sensitive to community concerns. We explore, continue to explore the possibility of privately owned sites. Although, given the things you raised earlier I don't hold too much stock in that. We direct staff to convene key stakeholders with the purpose of crafting site criteria to be considered and we return with detailed outreach plan to include that residents identify preferred eligibility criteria for potential inhabitants of bridge housing in their neighborhoods. Here is what I mean. Tonight when we were hearing the community speak we saw different levels of tolerance. Some neighbors were willing to bring tiny homes to my neighborhood. Others saying we are just scared because we don't want people with criminal back grounds or people dropping needles in our parks. To the extent that each district or each community or each potential site has different tolerance levels and we are considering 99 sites we should be having 99 community meetings and seeing what tolerance levels are and try to bring the right community to that. So the community should inform our selection criteria if possible of who we are trying to help. We are trying to help 250 people.
We can't help everybody with this go. I'm trying to work here and find 250 people that the community is comfortable having be a proximity to them. Lastly, I would just exclude from site consideration areas where significant prevalence of poverty and low income households. With those kind of addendums I would be willing to go with the mayor's memo. I can't make my substitute motion at the moment.

>> I do know if we were to order 99 community meetings I think ray's wife might file for divorce.

>> The council experts come up with a site to make a cut. Whatever that is like 50 sites left, 60 sites, whatever that is. There has to be a clean objective cut based on criteria that we sit down and create together. After that we go out and talk to the community.

>> And I embrace the basic concept that we don't need to be rigid about the number of units or people we house on a particular site. I think we find one site. If we can house 200 people you will see Jackie rushing right through that door to do it I'm certain. I'm sure she would be proposing that we do just that. I think the idea is to have a proposal and get the land first. And I think as we can see that is all the challenge is finding the site first. I think it's very open to discussion about how many we put on each site.

>> I guess going back to the key point is we need to have site criteria. We can't just say this is city owned land. We need to figure out what works for the homeless community and the people going into the tiny homes. They should maybe not be in a food desert and we make a clean cut and maybe that eliminates from some districts any potential sites. We work in good faith to make it happen at least house 250 people.

>> Fair point.

>> I'm done.

>> Thank you, mayor. So after listening to what I think the council member Rocha described I think it was a very well-stated argument. I think this is not the fastest approach. It's not the cheapest approach. It's not the most expedient approach. It's not the most agreeable approach. I don't necessarily want to put my money on something that may not work, may not
happen. It still has to go through community review, building, could take more than a year. Year estimate is 1.4 million for the first trial, correct?

>> Yeah. That was our initial.

>> It would house 20 people?

>> Yes, council member.

>> If you divide that out by the number of months you get $5,800. I would rather see that money just distributed to the homeless and see if we can get them housed immediately. [ Applause ]

>> I don't think that every district is the same. I don't have any 22 story buildings in my district. I don't have night clubs. I don't have a hospital. There are all kinds of stuff that is not in my district. I don't know -- I have been agreeable to permanent housing. One of the reasons why this site on there is because I recommended to Jackie to put it on as a permanent housing structure. We voted on something in my district a couple of weeks ago on a permanent housing structure. I have no problems providing housing for the homeless even in my district. I never voted against permanent housing in my district. But not all ideas are worth pursuing. I think this is going to take too much staff time. I would rather us focus our attentions on things that will get us to the goals faster which is basically focus on building, focus on -- if we have this $2.7 million and we really want it to go to work fast we should see if we can have homeless people sheltered in hotels overnight or sheltered in -- we can find units I don't care if it is one of those websites that allows you to rent for two weeks at a time. I think we have to pursue all options. And so you know I won't be supporting the current motion. I don't think the council should be supporting the current motion because as Jackie said this idea was discussed basically in December and I remember those meetings in December. They were long meetings and there was like hundreds and hundreds of stuff to vote on. Those meetings went past midnight. Maybe that is why we have a new curfew to make better educated decisions before midnight. I just don't think it will get us there. It's not fast, not cheap, not agreeable. I don't think we should waste anymore staff time or money doing this. PLAUZ I'm not going to be voting for the current motion. The underlying motion I am willing to support as a task force but I think it should be looking at alternative solutions, not this one. [ Applause ]
Just want clarity. This came before the council in 2014, didn't it? First came to community committee in 2014.

Every time the council asked you to move forward they explored tiny homes?

Yes, mayor.

Want to make sure we all understand we were responsible.

Just so I understand the current motion on the floor, so we are adopting some changes as council member Peralez suggested to the memo drafted one of the direction I think item 3 c that says recommendation as to CL pilot program that way opportunity costs. That would be part of coming back in 60 days, right? Is that my understanding? So within those 60 days do you think it would be a fair amount of time for you to come back and answer questions and concerns and viability of the program as it has been relayed by council member Rocha?

Absolutely because we are close to getting a prototype design completed and we can start we would like to come forward and award a contract with a developer and operator down the path of answering specific questions regarding costs.

It is coming back. Is this where we should be presenting money?

I would envision we would have just the range of opportunities and also the range of services. The pricing that we have provided really is I would say a gold plated high standard version of what this community could look like. So the example, the most obvious example to me is we have in this cost we have professional staff that acts as a property manager. We have security. There are other models that don't actually have -- that still have security but it is done by the residents themselves. So we can look to see what the range of options are and to give a broader range of a cost and that then the council can make a decision on how to move forward. We are pricing the most expensive options possible.

And then there was a few comments earlier I think about the sites. I understand and agree that it would be little hypocritical to take our publically owned sites off the list. Given the fact
that it is back on the table and we are looking at city-owned sites I would then assume that is fair to go and I think some of the direction of the memo does direct staff to do that work. I guess what I'm wondering and hoping for is that there is some very substantial, very real outreach to them. I don't know if any of my colleagues have had conversations with anyone. They are actively looking at lands within our city, within my district asking to build housing. And then they have vacant land just sitting there. For me it doesn't seem unreasonable to go to them and ask them, you have this land that is not near residential that is near light rail that is just sitting there. Why wouldn't that be a viable site? Those are things I am interested in exploring. For me and my community I think folks are reasonable enough to know that that may be a viable option instead of putting it on -- so I'm not quite sure how to make certain that that outreach does -- it's very real and deep and does occur and to the extent that some folks here that sit on the board can help with that I would encourage them to do that. I think it is very important and mayor you as vice chair I really hope you would be pushing for that and having those conversations.

>> I think it would help if we are all signing off a letter that goes to other board members, as well. We are all pushing to get it.

>> I do think frankly speaking and what we need is we need your help. So if what the original direction is to send out for another 60 days it is unlikely I will come back with any new sites. I will be frank. If we can get your help in a letter, in a call I think that will really help to push this forward. We need the political help to reach out to these partner public agencies to get them to release the sites.

>> And so based on the fact that in 60 days you are going to come back and touch on the viability of the project going forward and the fact that reaching out to water district and other folks to really look at sites, I think I will be supportive of this because as it stands it seems like with that criteria, again, my community sort of remains on the hook and certainly something if it so happens to be that the site lands on a district I think we will do everything possible to make sure it's the damn best site that we have ever had. Certainly it is a pilot. I think in all fairness I think we need to make all efforts to really find sites all over the city including in our district that are owned by these different entities. I want to see that when we come back in 60 days so I can go back to my community and say we have done everything we can to find sites that are not in the neighborhoods. Thank you.
On that note I know Reagan is drafting a letter now. You will see it tomorrow. We hope you sign on. Council member Frost.

Thanks, mayor. And from what I'm hearing it sounds like for the most part there is a lot of consensus up here maybe even just a little bit of confusion in regards to some of the direction. I agree with a lot of what my colleagues are saying, some of the stuff I don't necessarily agree with. I want to highlight some of the comments. It does sound outrageous that the cost that you look at this but it's even more outrageous to think that we could potentially give somebody $5,800 or allocate that for somebody to stay in a hotel when we know the individuals that we are talking about need care, support, staff necessary to do so and we have seen this even in sites as everybody knows and have utilized in these conversations. One is an example which has a lot of support but clearly wasn't enough. If we assume we can just allocate $5,800 to somebody to stay in a hotel room without anything else going to that we are fulling ourselves because something is going to go awry. Individual that needs the support is not going to get that support. We can't just throw money at it. We have to have the services to back it up which is why it is so costly which is why we want to provide that in these sites. We know that there is benefit to having them being smaller and to be as we have stated around these resources not necessarily excluded. To make that clear, the other item I think that was not so clear was the task force in context as I have previously mentioned and as I have been working on had nothing to do with bridge housing communities or anything of small portion. It's much larger than that. It was about collaboration. It's not about developing a task force for bridge house communities. That was not the idea which is why I did ask for that language to be taken out and the language from my memo which is very vague in regards to and I will read it request housing department to coordinate with destination home in planning next steps for development of task force. Council member Rocha's point it wasn't march, it was June. We only had four meetings since then. It was early June when the notion came to me and it just sat there initially and then we sat down for another follow up meeting and started looking around to see what are we doing and what task forces are out there. Month of July we recessed and I was gone for the month of July or at least two weeks of it for my honeymoon. Coming back I did get to work on it. It has been about four weeks. I am, though, completely comfortable with our city team and staff taking on that work. By no means do I have a selfish interest to do so. I just knew that if I wanted to get something like that done at least pull together the first meeting -- I absolutely do not think that my office should house these
meetings or lead the meetings. That's not the intent. The idea was putting in legwork on scheduling. If anything that is the hardest thing convincing people to come and find the right date on the calendar. That is what I offered up to do. And have had some conversations with county supervisor, ran it by the mayor and it was in its infancy of discussions it just so happened to surface itself in these discussions which is certainly highlighted that there is an interest which I appreciate my colleagues share an interest for. I think that council member Rocha made a good point that if we want to be able to do this and task our staff with it I think housing had a response that says we have to prioritize this. Council member Rocha pointed out we can certainly task our city manager and say this is something we want to do. My guess and tell me if I'm wrong, is that the suggestion might be still kicking its priority setting which is why I wanted to avoid that. If it's not, by all means, I'm willing to if my colleagues are in agreement I'm willing to say I think it is a decent idea and take it on.

>> I mean, you know, given the issue, I mean, if the impact is on staff, I mean, clearly the level of work here does suggest that we should do, you know, that we should do priority setting. Clearly, it does. Unless we can leverage, I mean, you know, there is some mention of, you know, destination home or some other entity that we could charge with helping us and we could provide support in attendance, then that is something we could explore.

>> Let me just offer. I know council member Peralez has strong relationships with organizations like destination home as we do. We are certainly happy to lend our service in helping to coordinate in any way we can and use conference room and all of those things to help support this effort. I think like you I feel that the last thing housing staff needs is more meetings other than meetings are critically needed for outreach to make things like this happen. They have so much on their plate. I hate to see them socked into another task force. There have been four. I observed a couple. That is plenty. I think we are all on a path to try to get things done.

>> Again, that's my intent was mainly helping on the -- if anything the administration portion which is going to people and talking about it, scheduling the first date and then deciding where people want to go from there. So again I'm still willing to do that and completely comfortable with it which is why I thought it would suggest to keep language within my motion as is and if it is something that indeed the rest of the council feels we should take up as a priority and task out to our staff I'm comfortable with that, as well.
I want to end to council member Rocha’s question. This is sort of what I brought up which is sort of call to question kind of thing. It is in the motion that I made. I have moved the majority of his memo which does talk about coming back in 60 days and prioritizing the sites for readiness to be able to look at whether the benefits of a bridge housing community program outweigh opportunities. I think those are great directions absolutely. I don't know if we are prepared to make that decision tonight one way or the other that we should stop pursuing bridge housing communities. I shared the same thought that council member Rocha did. Should we maybe be pursuing other efforts? I think the language in his memo gives us that opportunity to do so and not have to do so tonight. And then the question, though, which is are there better ways to get short term temporary housing? That is obviously the question. That is what we are looking at. We are not looking at permanent long term solutions. These are short term temporary solutions to my memorandum in 4.1. I highlight two of those which we pursued and staff reported on. To that question, staff, are there better ways to get short term temporary housing? The answer in that regard now and do you think you will be able to come back with a better answer in 60 days with that regard if we decide we don't want to consider pursuing bridge housing anymore and we want to do something else that is maybe more timely or more cost effective?

I think we can layout and review again in a coherent fashion or more comprehensive fashion all the different interim solutions we have been working on and what are the possibilities of moving forward. Whether it is safe parking program or expansion of the moheld/hotel or using money for homeless prevention or rapid rehousing. Those are all different opportunities that we can lay out and can give you information of the cost, whose the target population, how quickly is the resource being used. So I think we can come back with the menu of choices that we have been working on for you to decide how you would like us to move forward with the 2.4.

In the same 60-day response time period you're saying?

Yes.

That's obviously part of the motion as is already for this report back within 60 days. My hesitation and concern of just anything that sort of delays our progress is we go again yet
another year or another winter specifically where we are not achieving any of these solutions. We have been working on this bridge housing community for this opportunity for a couple years now. I do think we need to call to question on it and decide do we want to keep pursuing it or based on the totality of all the factors here that it's just not worth it and we are not going to achieve it. To council member's point I think he made some really good points one of them being in regards to first thing would be looking at site criteria but I think if we were to take that direction and do that what we would end up with if we factor in all the concerns and setbacks and where we want to put it we would end up with two sites or three sites. We know where they are at because we are looking at them today. It's the three sites we have on the board right now. We know what the response would be to those sites. We heard it tonight. We know what it would be because we had community meetings in district nine, district two. So I think if we went that route we really did come in and slice it, well, we would be looking at three sites that we have today and we would have to make the decision or not should we move forward on one of those. I'm comfortable if that's where we go. Again, I thought that maybe there was flexibility within that criteria that would open it up a little bit to not just those three sites and maybe it does open it up a little bit more with the goal and the intent trying to be ten. That's not a definitive. I appreciate for making that point and not wanting to be too rigid. It is an arbitrary goal. Let's put one in every district. The intent of that was for every council district to say we are going to be a part of this solution. At the end of the day we will go through criteria and say there is absolutely none -- it is just not going to happen. I think that is obvious to our colleagues that that may be the case. At least the intent I want to be there and that was sort of that intent. I I agree. I don't want that to be arbitrary guideline. Based on timeline and cost we are not going to put ten of them anyways. We will end up with just a few and based on the direction we have now and we are in agreement here we are looking at maybe three. Could even be just one. And I'm afraid that we go forward 60 days you come back and you're probably going to come back with the same exact cut. And you are going to be recommending us maybe these three, maybe one or two more. I hope at that point we are ready to make a decision to pull the trigger or not.

>> We will be coming back with designs and hopefully with a better idea of cost. Right now because we don't have the operator or the developer under contract and we're still in the process of the design but very close it's hard for us to really ensure that the cost will be $15,000 per unit. What if we see the design and it is 50,000 or 10,000? We don't have enough information frankly tonight which is why we didn't have very effective community
meetings either because we just didn't have enough information about what is possible. I think we need the couple of months to finish the design, get the developer and operator on board, hopefully Reagan's letter will be enough to get the other sites back to us that we will have a more robust conversation about the possibilities and really what it will cost us to make it go forward and you will see the menu of options.

>> So to try to find consensus. Council member Rocha is there any maybe language in massaging that would make you comfortable in taking out that elimination of all city-owned sites? So something that -- right now we are just -- we did throw out arbitrary ten sites, eliminate the criteria. We suggested a little bit of addition to the criteria. Your suggestion eliminating those, that was too far for me to support. Is there something in between? That seems to be the only sort of contentious issue.

>> Thank you for the question. Appreciate it. It goes back to I think one of the first statements made by council member Jimenez which was the process. I think council member covered it quite well. I think it is that approach that is troubling me. It is not putting them all back on. My advocacy is for a good policy approach. It's not -- with all due respect it's not my residents. There is one site in district nine out of almost 100. The likelihood that it would land in my district I assume is pretty thin. So it's just about the policy approach to this issue and how we are getting at it and to say we will put all 99 back on with no criteria in terms of setbacks, we really didn't have I guess a thorough policy discussion on that. I appreciate that we will come back with that policy discussion and maybe at that point we can provide input. It is more of an uncomfortableness with the approach than the outcome. I appreciate the question. It's a very good one. I appreciate you trying to be inclusive in engaging this. The suggestion that we are not going to have criteria and we are going to start over and the ones listed by yourself and mayor and colleagues are also general. That is fine, too, as well. I don't know what the outcome is going to be through the whole exercise. To suggest we are not going to have setback from a park, school or residential use, that I'm uncomfortable with. I'm going on and on. I appreciate it. I want to get there with you. I don't disagree with anything my colleagues talk about. I think we are all on the same page. That is the remaining item. Thank you for asking the question. I don't think I answered your question.

>> At least I'm not suggesting or anybody else is suggesting that we won't end up with some sort of setback from schools or housing. But at least we can agree that if we go with the
criteria that housing has denoted today with 150 or whatever setback that we know what sites we are looking at. It's just the last three. And we all are sort of in consensus that we should probably open that up a little bit or make a decision and say yes or no. That gets bridge housing moving. It will piss off a lot of people that came here today, but I think that I'm not saying there won't be any setbacks but if we stick with the criteria we have now and don't open that back up we know what we are looking at. If we go with your suggestion which is eliminate it all we know we have zero now. So that's what I'm trying to find. I think 60 days quite honestly might allow us that opportunity. Tell me if I'm wrong but I'm thinking 60 days can allow the opportunity for you to come back to answer the questions that council member Rocha did put in his memo and then that day we can be able to answer the question yes or no bridge housing communities in district two or ten or eight or three or whatever it may be. Again, if council member Rocha goes with your language then we are just really looking at sites that we don't own so we don't have that opportunity. So is that -- do you think we will make that decision in 60 days? That we will have that more sites than just the three?

>> It could be I'm tired right now because I did a giant move yesterday, but I am a little concerned about the sequencing as I'm hearing this. Because I want to make sure I understand it. If one of your expectations is that the letter is successful and we are going to get additional sites, is what you are directing us to do is just return with the list of the additional sites and then we would talk about criteria because I am then imagining a room filled of people who are just hearing about the new list that we would be publishing that we get that could just set us up for another giant reaction? So I'm not sure how the new sites fit in through this process, but I do think absent just dropping those new sites in that we will have more clarity in 60 days and that we could again think about that criteria in a more thoughtful way and present those back to you.

>> And again I would be willing to say that we should have some guiding direction in incorporating some sort of setback. I know that is one of the issues that council member Rocha is discussing here. Without denoting it, how far that setback is, that may be considered within the criteria. And then I will just pose it again because you did not answer the question. Is there anything that would allow you to move from your position of just eliminating all city owned vacant sites or are you just not ready to go there?
Thank you, again. You are right. I don't think I answered it. I think the process that you just went through is the fact that these limited setbacks that the housing department came up with which as I pointed out are below a whole bunch of other items that we established for setbacks, if they are below that and we eliminate 96 sites then maybe which leads me to that question that you are on which I'm on the same space with you still that maybe this isn't the best model or the location is not conducive to the type of use and should we be spending energy and resources in another way. If it gets us there with minimum setbacks maybe we are not in the right place. These are probably reasonable. [Applause] Thank you for trying. I appreciate it. I don't know if you have a bet with somebody to get a unanimous vote on this but come back to me if you want.

He is in the middle of his bingo cards.

I think there is consensus here. I think the big question is do we pursue these or not? Do we continue going down this road? I think council member Rocha is making the point that based on the criteria as is and we end up with just the three sites he feels that criteria is reasonable so his recommendation is eliminate all city owned vacant sites. I'm saying be a little more clear that that means why don't we stop bridge housing community as us doing effort let's send the letter. That is where your memo is leading. Otherwise we open it back up and make a decision on yes or no at least one, two or three of the sites. And I do hope that in 60 days we make the decision because I don't want to kick it out farther. Then we definitely are wasting our time and should be pursuing something else and yes we have tasked it with this and given the policy direction here. We are looking for the solutions. It's because we are hearing it from our community and those that are housed and being effected by those that are homeless in the community and we are trying to find the solutions and just bantering back and forth and studying this and that, it doesn't get us anywhere or create more housing. It doesn't get us anywhere, it didn't create us anymore housing, and maybe Johnny's idea of giving them $5800 and putting them up in some hotel, and I'm shortening that, Johnny. I'm going to stick with the prediction that I've provided in my motion and there was the last incorporation of the letter and if it needs to be restated, i can.

Okay. I think we got it. Let me just offer one additional perspective. If we decide we're going to give up on bridge housing and move on to something else, let me suggest that whatever else that thing might be, whatever it is we're moving on to, still requires to do exactly
what we’re doing right now, which is to find a site to house homeless people. Even if you give $5800 to each homeless individual, we just went through a year where we couldn't spend rapid rehousing money even though we had the cash because there was literally no inventory of apartments to house them in. So it's not a solution to give them money, because there's nowhere literally for them to go. So we've got to do this really difficult work of finding sites, no matter what we do. And appropriate that we do it in a bridge housing context. Because, as we know, this is an opportunity to do something less expensive than we’re going to be doing in other contexts, because we’re going to be doing this a lot.

>> I just wanted to add, to the council member's point, my amendments were not intended as a poison pill or a way to jujitsu the way out of getting a housing site placed. What my intent was not to be creating a task force or long, prolonged community meeting. I feel a sense of urgency. The clock is ticking. My basic of premise the is operations. Let's get experts in a room, policymakers in a many room. Let's make the cut on the 99 sites, whatever we have left and talk with the communities, and gauge their tolerance. I don't want to prolong six month, let's come up with criteria. I'm saying we can come up with criteria in like four weeks. The policy folks, the wonks get down together and say here's what we want, let's go out to the community and get their input after we have something to present. I think that, I understand that we have an exemption for the city. I understand this is a platform for the city of San José to shine as one of the tenth largest cities in the country to be a leader on this. And I see that any other solution we throw at it by using the money in another way doesn't end up in housing. I want to speed it up, actually. That's just where I'm at. [APPLAUSE]

>> I think we're all talked out. No, council member Jones.

>> I'll keep did short. I want to first of all appreciate your endurance for seeing through this conversation. Just real quick, every day or almost every day, we either get a phone call or an e-mail about a homeless encampment. And my residents are demanding for me to do something about it. So we'll mobilize my staff, we'll work with the San José P.D., the homeless response team, other agencies if the encampment's on their property, and we'll get, you know, go in and do a sweep. We'll get the homeless removed from that location. And then they're either back at that same location, or they move down the street to another location. And I will get an e-mail from those constituents saying, chappie, you don't care about us. You're not doing anything. You're not responding to our immediates. And they always, you know, have
chappie capitalized in their e-mail. To make their point. [LAUGHTER] And press repeat, because again, that scenario happens again and again and again and again. And all of us up here are looking for solutions. And we don’t want to go through this continuous loop of going in, sweeping the homeless, and then having them come back and not having solution. So I think the genesis of this conversation is that we are desperately looking for solutions to this problem. And I don’t think we should take anything off the table to resolve this problem. Whether it’s sanctioned encampments, whether it’s tiny homes, accessory dwellings. I think we should look at every potential option. And if we’re talking about like a cost benefit analysis, then we need to put sanctioned encampments back on the table. Because if you’re talking about a rapid response at a lower cost, that’s one solution. But we debated that. And the council made a decision that that wasn’t the direction we wanted to go in. The direction we wanted to go in was tiny homes. So that’s where we moved forward. So to say let’s reevaluate that because of a cost benefit analysis really does a disservice to the debate, conversation and strategy we decide to move forward on. I definitely want to stress that the process was broken. It did a disservice to the community. But I also want to stress that we need to partner with the community, partner with the neighborhoods to come up with solutions. You can’t always just have, no, we don’t want the homeless in our area, in our maybe hoods, so figure out another solution. Ship them off somewhere else. That is not a solution that is going to work. It hasn’t worked in the past, and it’s not going to work in the future. We need to have a collaboration with the community to identify ways it can work in your neighborhood. It might be focussing on homeless seniors, which is a growing part of the homeless population. It might be focussing on young adults transitioning out of foster care who are now becoming a major part of the homeless population. It could be working, working homeless. I know specifically of a gentleman that worked at one of my good friends’ gym. And he was going to work, taking showers at work, getting dressed a then living in his car. He’s not a menace to your society. He’s going to work every day, doing the right things, but he does not have a place to live. I want to see the community step forward and say, look, there are certain types of homeless, maybe people that are involved with drugs or crime or other elements, that we don’t feel safe in our community, but there are other homeless that we feel that we can work with, collaborate with the city and support them. Think how powerful that could be if you have homeless seniors that were housed and you worked with, you know, girl scout and boy scout troops to work with them and get to know them and give the seniors, actually, somebody to talk to and, And relate to and spend time with. That could be a community-based effort to do something like that. So I guess I just want to end with saying that we have to work together to
find solutions. If we keep battling, if we keep going against each other with all this contention, then I'm going to continue to get those e-mails every day, and I'm going to continue to get e-mails from people who are frustrated that we didn't solve the problem. We need to solve the problem and address it as quickly as possible. [APPLAUSE]

>> All right. Okay, with that, I believe we have a motion? Does anybody want the motion restated or clarified? It's a super exciting motion. I heard a yes. So council member, care to -

>> Yeah, I'll give it a shot here. So it's council member Rocha's memo. And it incorporates pieces of a memo I cosigned and pieces of a memo where council member mendes and his colleagues signed, but it eliminates their recommendation number one And exchanges it for recommendation one from the memo that I signed onto. It changes, it eliminates reclamation 3b II and exchanges it with the language from my recommendation from mine of 4.1, the solo memo. My recommendation number two. Oh, yeah, sure, maybe I'll ask the clerk to post. Thank you for that. It's confusing for us, too. Sorry.

>> He's moving on this memo. But he's taking out, this whole section's coming out.

>> Tell you what, why don't we do this. Can we, I think we can provide some short hand to describe the paragraphs you're substituting. Maybe that would be most helpful.

>> If you'd give me one moment, I have it all typed out. I can sent that on.

>> She's got it typed up.

>> That makes it easier.

>> How's he doing that?

>> So our clerk is going to display it, type it out and display it.

>> Great.
So, as we're stalling, can I hear from council member Davis how her weekend was, maybe? Fill in some time?

No.

I think you're just upset because I couldn't attend the Cambrian festival.

We could start discussing 4.1.

We could, but I think that would really get everyone confused.

All right, so we'll take a one-minute break here while we get all that up and running.

So, at the top is the motion to Rocha's memo. Add paragraph one and six signed by the mayor, those excerpts are copied and pasted at the bottom. The bottom one's recommendation six. And then paragraph two from council member's memo, I don't -- don't think I put that on there, authorizes the city to sign the letter. From item 4.1 and one and six I've combined. So all the language is there.

And the letter actually goes to multiple public agencies, not just the county water district. Other districts that we think are yeah. Eta, yeah, that's a big one. Okay. Now any other comment for clarification purposes here? Council member Kennis?

I'm willing to sign the letter, but if we could bifurcate that, I'm willing to vote for the letter, but I cannot support the entire motion.

Well, you know, you can sign the letter anyway even if you don't vote for the motion. Either way, we'll give you the letter. [ LAUGHTER ] Save you some time. Yes.

I don't want him to think that it was the letter that caused me not to vote for it.

It's now on the record, you like the letter. You haven't even read it yet, but you like it. All right. Good. Any other questions? Let's vote on the motion from council member Perrals.
Don't everyone go anywhere yet, we've still got -- okay, that motion passes. On to item 4.1. motion to accept the report. The question's council member paralis.

>> I think part of the issue, council member Jones just spoke about it, which was in regards to the memo that I wrote, which would now be recommendation one. Which is taking up these other items that I think are still important, which is safe parking and sanctioned encampments as possible, viable options. I think that staff denoted in their report, it was not, i guess, the only difference i would say to council member Jones' statements, it wasn't council direction to stop pursuing sanctioned encampments. We gave the direction, but we did prioritize these bridge housing communities. And that's where staff has been prioritizing their time. I can only imagine how difficult it'd be to go down the route of sanctioned encampments if we're struggling here with bridge housing communities.

>> Oh, yeah.

>> But we didn't necessarily, as a council, decide to just eliminate that. We had put that in a whole package of probably way too many things to housing. As items to pursue. I do understand that the safe parking was pursued. And there was an rfp that was put out. We didn't have any responses. Again, to council member Jones' point, we're not even seeing that these bridge housing communities, that we're even going to get one of these. Again, I do not want to eliminate potential opportunities on the table. But I hear staff when you say in the report here, at least with the safe parking, that if we do want to pursue it again as a council, the suggestion would be that it go to priority setting, that that be something that we have to task individually. I honestly think that's where we went wrong the first time around when we first prioritized the whole package, where we basically gave you and your staff a whole list of things to pursue, sort of the kitchen sink. And we didn't divide that up. And you have been pursuing a number of these, and indeed, safe parking was one of them, but without a response on the rfps that it was going to work for us, you've stopped. And I think the biggest thing that I wanted today was a report on that. Appreciate you reporting back, because initially, I just didn't know what happened with that, and I had community members that were wondering what's happening with sanctioned encampments or what's happening with the safe parking, and I think, in that regard, we should have at least had an earlier update if we had decided hey, we put the rfp up. Nobody responded. We're not going to pursue it anymore. That's now off the list. I'm comfortable with the safe parking needing to go to priority setting. Maybe to
allow that to make it through as we've done last time through the first round and be it an item that we already prioritized if that's something that you're comfortable with, my colleagues are okay with, that would be part of my motion and that we do not eliminate sanctioned encampments as a priority to pursue. [APPLAUSE ] I would continue to say we've given you the bridge housing communities. And certainly, if we're not successful on these bridge housing communities, we need to absolutely continue to be considering things like sanctioned encampments, like the safe parking, because we don't have many options of short-term solutions. And so that's the confusing motion there, but in essence, it's the item that I drafted. We already approved item two, a recommendation two, but it would be recommendation one, and I am comfortable with safe parking going to priority setting.

>> Okay. So the motion -- is that a motion or request --

>> I'm fine with withdrawing my motion. I forgot you had a memo on it.

>> Just second?

>> I have to withdraw first. I need to withdraw my motion, I'm sore eye. -- sorry.

>> I apologize.

>> Are you making a motion then?

>> That was a motion.

>> Let me just try to qualify the history here. My recollection is that we went out for rfps on both, didn't we, looking for nonprofits that would be toll manage either a safe parking program or a sanctioned encampment program. One's saying yes, one's saying no.

>> No, mayor, we went out with rfps for the safe parking program. We partnered with the county on an unconventional housing rfp that they went out with. And that was following the task force recommendations.

>> And we offered some options.
>> We did.

>> And nobody said we're willing to go do this.

>> And no one came back with a sanctioned encampment model for San José. There was two proposals that came through, one was the Evans lane model and the other was compassion center.

>> Got it. It's clear now. Thank you. So there are two separate rfps. I now that to do safe parking, in addition to an rfp, we also need to revise the ordnance. That's why the council member wisely said let's go to priority setting, but we still have to do the rfp, right?

>> We would. Just to say that there are organizations that are doing safe parking throughout the state. And, you know, I do believe staff feels like there's viability in this program, but we felt like the best way to pursue, move forward, because we really were trying to locate this on private land, would be a change to the, would be a new creation of a new order thank -- ordnance that would allow for this use.

>> I'm willing to approve it as long as staff think it's a viable use. It, we know we're not. That was a big issue. On the sanction the encampment, I know we had this discussion two years ago. And I remember saying specifically on the dais a couple times, we're going to have a hard time finding a neighborhood willing to take a sanctioned encampment. And we know that's a few steps removed from bridge housing, which we hope to unveil beautiful designs for enclosed homes where people live inside in a dignified space in something that would not be a blight on the neighborhood. I can't imagine we won't be beating our heads against a wall or even worse, carrying the wall with us if we're going down the sanctioned encampment path after what we just experienced. So much is about failing forward. We're going to try a lot of different things. Some might work. But we have to move on. When do we move on from sanctioned encampments? What do we need to try and fail at? What's sort of the line?

>> Is that a question?

>> Yes, that's a question.
I think at the moment I don't have anywhere between 50 to 80 unsanctioned encampments in my section on any given night. I'm banging my head on it every single night. And every single night, there's people camping, and it's unsanctioned. And here we are spending two years on bridge housing community. We're failing at safe parking. Granted. We're doing a lot of good things. I'm not saying we're not. But for the short-term, immediate solutions, we just continue to have people out in unsanctioned encampments, and we continue to sweep them and my community members are fed up with this. And I don't think we're winning any support to do things like bridge community, the more we allow these encampments and we go around sweeping them. For me, I understand the realities there, mayor, especially given the conversation on bridge housing communities on how difficult that's going to be. I'm just not willing to give up on it.

Appreciate the determination to move forward.

Let me just offer this. Given the mission that we've routinely given our housing department to go out into neighborhoods where they are not being warmly greeted, to put it mildly, I am not eager to follow that path. I understand the intention, I laud the altruism. I simply think there's a lot more things we have to work on, like housing than to spin our wheels. Given how hard it already is for bridge housing. So I'm not going to support the motion as it is, though I certainly hope that if someone finds a way for sanctioned encampments to actually work, I would be happy it to applaud. I just don't think we've seen it yet. Council member?

Just a quick question. I want to understand. So by approving this, we're going to be just, we're going to be pausing the dispersion policy? Until further analysis or evaluation? Is that?

Council member, I think you're going to the underlying memo, which examined our current dispersion policy. The underlying issue is the dispersion policy we were looking at from the late '80s that was outdated in terms of how we should disperse affordable housing.

Good, because I was going to ask you how that's playing out in the context of bridge housing.
>> I agree with the mayor. I was here for that discussion. The council may not remember, but it was another heated, long evening like this. And I'm, so I'm not supporting the current motion. I do, I do think that we are attempting to try bridge housing in, I remember putting the Evans lane project being put forward as a bridge housing solution. I think it was called something else, not bridge, but temporary housing or something that will bridge them to the next level. And you know, this is another reason why I voted the way I did on the last motion. I just want us to do something right. That particular thing, that particular project was promised that it was going to be done in six months, and we had developers saying we can get things done in two years if you just give us the shot. How long has it been since we approved Evans lane?

>> I think it's been a year.

>> Okay. So how close are we to getting Evans lane across the bridge?

>> Well, it is currently, the issue with Evans lane right now is the mitigation for water. And there are two solutions. It's just taken so much longer because of the site constraints

>> Yeah.

>> That it hasn't been able to finish. Still in planning.

>> I really feel for you. I'm honestly, I think people think that you and I have an adversarial relationship, but I think that I envy your, I mean, I don't envy your position, because we're giving you so much work to do. And I would like our department focussed on accomplishing tasks that we've already approved. We all are coming from the most pure heart here. All of us want to solve this problem tomorrow. But every time we give Jack more things to do, it's going to take away from Evans lane. It's going to take away from the 697 units she's trying to build today. Permanent units. So I don't want to, I'm not going to approve anything else for Jackie to do. As far as I'm concerned. Until we get some, some work done. That's why I'm not, you know, comfortable going down even more bridge housing. Let's get some stuff done, and let's give your staff some bandwidth to get things done. You're going to be dealing with rent control in a couple days. And I'm sure that's no, that's not a, that's going to be a walk in the park for you, of course. So forgive me, I don't want to offend any one of my colleagues, but I would like
our housing department to focus on, and no offense to raoul. I know he's doing his best. But I'd like us to focus, because, if you're not focussed, you're not going to get things done, and that's where I'm coming from.

>> Okay. On the motion, any other comments? Questions? All right. Council member a pa Ralis?

>> I want to make sure it did incorporate staff's supplemental. To include their supplemental.

>> Forgive me, I missed the supplemental. That was just issued today?

>> Don't know the date.

>> That would have us coming back in October?

>> Mayor, the supplemental discusses a study session that we had coming back to council on October 20th on the general issue of homelessness and interventions. It provides an avenue for a few option like safe parking where we would go to priority setting. There are a few items.

>> Thanks for bringing us all up to speed. Okay. So that's part of the motion. Council member?

>> I want to say that I there were some folks who got here a little late who were interested in speaking on these items. I don't now if you would allow that or --

>> Typically, I don't, because, will, for lot the of reasons, but if there's a request to do so and someone would like to speak right now, we will take them right now. You have a minute. I'm sorry, that's what everyone else got on the item. I ask that you fill out a card after you speak. Okay. Great.

>> Hi, my name is vera clanton. I'm here today as a homeowner and parent in the shasta hanchet neighborhood. I was held up by a screaming toddler. Thanks for hearing me. Mostly, I want to say that we need to move forward with temporary solutions, temporary solutions and permanent solutions are not mutually exclusive. We need both. I hear the concerns of some
people about the shortcomings of tiny houses, but what I want To make sure is that we don't just have people here and people in the community saying this isn't enough. We want to do more. If people in the community and people here want to do more, I but I think then it is incumbent upon you to come back with a solution. I welcome tiny homes And encampments in my district, in my neighborhood, near my children's schools. I need my children to see that people are not disposable when think fall on hard times. We need to model that for them. I do hear many of my fellow san Josés are following the national fear of those different from us. We have more work to do, but i hope to do it with your good example tonight.

>> Thank you. [ APPLAUSE ]

>> My name is jolene Jones. I was disappointed to hear the talk on bridge housing community that what Karen Gillette talked about, who was involved in the bridge housing community specifically set. The vision needs to be set. You guys spent about two hours talking about siting. The vision of safe park, the vision of safe encampments. That is what the task forces, and I don't want to say task force. It should be a working group. I'm really saddened to see how that went down. And I just want to say, it's all about public engagement. That is why the winter faith collaborative, which i co-founded, was so successful. It's the only reason. How else were we able to get700 people served? We engaged the community. We talk the about who the unhoused are. That is how you do it. You do not do it up here. You do not do it here. You do it with the people. That is why that's so innovative. And we want to move forward with any of these, that is the only way. This going to happen. We are going to keep being here year after year. We've been doing this since 2014. Are you kidding me? We're San José. Where is the innovation? It's with the people. And all due respect, it's not here.

>> Thank you very much. On the motion, any other questions? Yeah, vice mayor?

>> Thank you. So I just want to, a point of clarification. Aside from incorporating staff's recommendations, this is to council member peralice. You're suggesting we send to priority the sanctioned encampments?

>> No, I was okay with the safe parking going to priority. The sanction the encampments I'd like to maintain as a current priority that staff continues to work on within obviously, their plethora of other tasks, denoting that clearly bridge housing communities is priority in that
regard. At this moment, staff has stopped working on pursuing any encampments. Legal encampments. So I would like to bring that back as we have previously prioritized it to housing staff, and not need that to go to priority setting.

>> Anything more? Vice mayor?

>> I would support it going back to priority setting. If you would be willing to make that amendment.

>> No, I just, we already did prioritize it previously. And I’d rather not, with that. I understand there’s more difficulties with safe parking. So there’s more that are, but no.

>> Council member?

>> Just to clarify, we passed the memo. We’re asking housing staff to come up with a, do some studies and come back with a plan. We're not at this moment giving the Green light to sanctioned encampments, right? Or is this the Green light right here? We’re just coming back with more?

>> My understanding is telling staff to go work on it.

>> Yeah, and come back with a plan for piloting, but it's not establish the pilot. The plan has to come back as i understand.

>> It's a bit late.

>> I understand. Real quick. Encampments have happened in other cities. I think Oakland. And we've talked about this in passing somewhat. And I think housing has some reservations. Could you just remind me what those were?

>> Sure, actually, and I'm a little confused of the history, because what I recall was when we last came forward with sanctioned encampments, the agreement was we were not moving forward with sanctioned encampments and instead, we were moving forward with bridge
communities. So I'm not recalling that we still had any work left on sanctioned encampments as part of our work plan. So I just would like clarification on that.

>> I believe that was after we went out for the rfp and no nonprofits responded that they wanted to do this.

>> With the county. And nobody came back with the sanctioned encampment. We had this whole council meeting on it and at the last minute we said okay, let's not move forward with sanctioned encampments because we believe there's hope it with bridge communities. It has not been a priority for us. It has not been an item even close on our work plan. And why is because we have felt that sanctioned encampments don't really address a fundamental issue regarding dignity and quality of life for people. And frankly, I feel that people would think that we have solved a short-term problem by allowing people to live in sub-standard conditions. And we have seen in other communities how those conditions quickly deteriorate. And whether it's the fire in Oakland or it's a drug outbreak in Oakland as well or if it's rats coming out and visiting at night, we know from experience that they have not been safe, habitable structures, and we just feel like we should be able to do better here. It should not be acceptable to have people living in those conditions. We feel like we need to keep trying them. We need to keep looking for another solution that brings people out. Back inside.

>> Council members, just to add, you know, the whole focus of ab 2176 was to provide us with some regulatory relief so we could move forward with something. We kind of fall back into the morass of all the regular La Tor eye issues that exist in the city attorney's memo when we look at how we could successfully site the sanctioned encampment, let alone finding the location. It's a challenging process.

>> Thank you for refreshing my recollection.

>> Council member?

>> Thank you, mayor. I agree with everybody who has said that housing has the hardest job. You guys are doing a great job, first of all. And I really appreciate all your work. I will be supporting council member peralis's motion, because I agree that the problem will not be solved by sanctioned encampments, but as the council member pointed out, we have a lot of
unsanctioned encampments now. [ APPLAUSE ] And I think that if we can improve the safety and the sanitation for the people who are living in those encampments now that that gets us one step closer or better than what we have right now. I don't think it's, I don't think it's a solution. I don't think any of us up here want a permanent tent city. But at the same time, I looked at this Seattle study that you mentioned earlier. Much, much earlier today. And they did a mix. They did a mix of tiny homes and sanctioned encampments and tiny homes in sanctioned encampments. And you're right. The tiny homes had better outcomes, but the sanctioned encampments didn't have terrible outcomes. And so if we can do a mix, because that's what's, you know, there's different kinds of land available or we can do the sanctioned encampments quicker or not, I think we can't, we can't rule anything out. Because lives are on the line. And if we can make it a bit safer, then we should. [ APPLAUSE ] So that's, and I really appreciate those comments. I guess what we would say, you know, in terms of how we could even possibly move forward with sanctioned encampments, we would want some parameters and direction regarding where you think you would like us to look to site these sanctioned encampments. So would you want us to go back through the list of 99 city-owned sites and start there? Is that how you would like us to start working out the plan?

>>> I might offer a suggestion. I'm sorry? Council member? I could offer a suggestion or two. We need two things for a sanctioned encampment to work if we believe it is going to work at all. And I think several of us are pessimistic about that. But you need a site. And you need a - site and a nonprofit to run it. There's a reason why they don't want to run them. If we had another rfp, specifically on sanctioned encampments and an eager non-profit ready to go, that would at least bound one hurdle. I don't know if it's possible to cut and past from the old rfp and issue it again. If that's some minimal amount of staff work, before we send you off to be slaughtered by the lions, we actually, we'd actually check though see if there's someone who wants to run one of these things. Is there a way for us to dip the proverbial toe in the water?

>>> Absent a specific site location or budget, we could issue an rfq and see if we could find an operator encampment. Having better understanding of what a sanctioned encampment would entail in this context would be helpful, so we can provide a bit more definition to that.

>>> Okay. Obviously, I'm not the one supporting this, but I just want to suggest a way for us not to have staff wasting a lot of time on an idea that we've largely tried and has already failed. And so if we can do did in a way with a minimal amount of staff work at least, that would
enable us to focus our work. If we don’t prioritize, if we don’t focus, nothing gets done, and we’ve just got to focus. We’ve been mired in this, this issue, I think, too long. Council member peralis?

>> I recall it slightly differently than you do, Jackie. I don’t recall that we quoted to stop pursuing sanctioned encampments. I do recall when we voted to prioritize bridge communities. I could be recalling it wrong. But my recollection was that after a, and just to clarify again. It wasn’t our rfp, it was the county’s. And so after that rfp [ APPLAUSE ] We did, on our end, prioritize nor all the right reasons. Obviously, much better housing than tents, right? Or these bridge housing communities. Don’t disagree with that. It was never my understanding that we, we, on our end, were stopping our priority of the opportunities of sanctioned encampments, even all be it the way that council member Davis just described, that could it be combined with the bridge community. I am bringing back up again and stating that I think that should remain a priority. And that we could find a way for it to fit in these bridge housing communities or all be it in 60 days we determine we’re not going to do any bridge housing communities, again, i will stress and thank you, council member Davis for pointing it out, but yeah, these are not the most, you know, preferred types of housing. It’s certainly not the most dignified. But it’s happening right now. It's happening tonight, and, so, you know, I'll beat the dead horse. And I'm comfortable, that's why I like, to be quite honest, vice mayor, that's why I don't necessarily want to kick this to priority setting. I'd, honestly, I'd rather get a decision from the council tonight that says yes or no, it's either going to remain as something that we're going to work towards or the majority of the council says we're just not going to go after sanctioned encampments to my understanding we hadn't done that before. So it will be very clear for me tonight, if that's the vote of the council, the will of the council.

>> Vice mayor?

>> Thank you. What I will address is, and I've heard the conversation before about the dignified living conditions and, I just wanted to just address that, that sometimes that's difficult for me to hear, because we already know where our houseless population are living. And so whether it's sanctioned or not sanctioned, I think we need to be careful about whether we use that as a reasoning not to pursue it. And that wasn’t the reason why i was talking about priority session. I was really referring to priority session more, more than anything because we've just talked about bridge housing and how difficult we're having in terms of the timing and the
constraints on, you know, and we've been here since 4:00, just, you know, dealing with public testimony and council conversations. And that's just today. In terms of testimony. And I don't know how long you've been just working on it, leading up to this. And so I think that there's quite a sense of urgency and just looking at our weather over the next couple of days. We're going to have a heat wave that's coming up, and that's a real concern. Just over the next few days. But the heat wave is one thing. And winter is coming. And it's going to be wet again. And I don't know where the 4,000 individuals are going to go. And I don't know what sanctioned encampments look like. But I do know what teeny homes will look like, and what keeping families dry and safe look like. And so I'm feeling the same level of stress that I felt when I first took office and we were first talking about this, and when you first came into my office and I said I don't know how to wrap my brain around this. That was the conversation I had with you. And so I actually wish that we could deal with and not go to priority setting, but I understand the process, and I've been trying to respectful of it, but the safe parking. I don't know why it got pulled off. The safe parking project at our lady of guadalupe, because my biggest concern was those women with children who are very concerned about their children being safe at night. And then that didn't happen. And just making sure that at some point, that we really deal with that. And making sure that those that are living in their cars or rvs and I urge the council that when priority setting happens, and I don't even know when it is going to happen again. I thought it was going to happen twice a year.

>> The next priority setting will be the beginning of October. Within the next week, we'll get out an info memo reporting on the progress of the current priorities.

>> There you go. But this, it's, again, nothing is off the table. And I, we, they're living in our streets. They're living in our parking lots already. They're living in our neighborhoods. And we, we need to make sure that our families, even if they don't have a permanent roof over their heads, that we make sure that they're safe in one way or the other. But I'll tell you. Where I'm seeing it most chronically is the in schools where our children and students are really having such a difficult time staying focussed and having that stability and where we're trying to still feed them and giving them a homework center so that they can have some sort of stability, even if it's just for those six, seven hours while they're at school. So anyway, that's my plug. So, so tell me then, because it sounds like, and I'm seeing where possibly the votes are going to fall for it, council member's motion. So what are the parameters so that you can still continue to do the rest of your work, regarding tiny homes And regarding all the other tasks
that we’ve tasked you with, but regarding this one item, the sanctioned encampments. What are those parameters that we are discussing here so that it’s not pulling you away from the other work? Or maybe, city manager? Is that your job?

>> The way I heard ray say, my only suggestion would be is that can we wait until we come back with the bridge housing analysis? Before, before you evaluate issuing the rfq? I don't know if that helps from a timing perspective, but there’s still a lot of work, but Jackie?

>> If we’re going to pull out the old rfq that we did, we could work on that. I think we would have to also then get together with the city attorney’s office and work through how we would get through the three primary issues that they raised, that we would need more support on to better understand, whether it's the landlord/tenant law, whether we're creating a camping perk. There are issues we'd have to better coordinate with to understand how to move a sanctioned encampment forward if you wanted to do it under the legal parameters that were outlined in the city attorney’s memo. Those would be issues we would have to better understand.

>> So, and just in terms of clarification, that memo Is attached. This is from 2015. Before we got bridge housing through. But this, this describes in general the kind of constraints and the way that the city would by, using city-owned land, because the, the avenue for this kind of thing, the authorizations are under the special occupancy parks act, unless the city owns the land. And it would be an exception to the special occupancy part for the city owning the land. And so it is challenging to do this consistent with the constraints in state law. It's possible. I don't think we have a general plan designated for camping or camp grounds. So we'd need to consider that issue. You know, this sanction the encampment is specifically not part of ab 2176. And in the negotiations it was made very, I have clear that ab 2176 wasn't intended to apply to sanctioned encampments or incorporate sanctioned encampments, so yes, there's sort of a process, I guess we would have to kind of develop like a critical path for this, to look at the obstacles. And there is a path. It's just sort of laying out, okay, what do we have to do? And I think the reason not finding an operator sort of stopped us because, you know, that meant that you didn't get to the rest of the critical path.

>> So just a clarification, shasta. So before we would issue the rfq, we’d have to address the legal issues that you just raised?
Well, you wouldn't have to, but one of, it's my understanding that one of the comments from the operators was that they were uncomfortable if they thought they were going to operate something that wasn't legal under state law.

Vice mayor? Did you want to -- okay. Council member?

Thank you. So I thought we had the tough conversation already finished and wrapped up. But surprise! This is just as difficult, if not more, because I realize that encampments already exist throughout all of our districts. District eight certainly is no exception. We have folks living in our Thompson creek. And we, you know, folks clean up. And people return and, you know, embankments get eroded. There's, there's issues with, you know, I have an issue with people living in a creek and having a legalized encampment, when someone asked, I think it was the vice mayor that asked, how would this look like? What would it look like? And I automatically, I thought back to the days where my parents talked about when they were migrant farm workers. And, you know, the living arrangements on site were just substandard, inhuman. And, and, you know, they shared how difficult it was to have children with them. Those were my older siblings. And I think about our families. Having maybe the same conditions here. My concern would be in these encampments, would we allow families? Would we allow children to live on site? You know, and I'm conflicted. I want to make sure that the women and the children have adequate shelter, but we all know andivy mentioned this concern in the past, that that's an invisible homeless population that doesn't get served and addressed all the time. Because they're just so invisible and understandably so, right, because they're protecting their children. And they want to make sure that they don't get separated from their children by, by risking themselves out in the street or in an encampment, but I wonder if this would open that up. I worry about, I really worry families and what we're setting people up or the possibilities up. And I'll tell you that when i worked in drug court and the judge, if they realized through conversations with parents who were trying to reunite with their children that if they had been at the jungle, had been at encampments, they were really risking that reunification with their children. And the judge, I've heard judges, you know, they have great, great hearts over in the drug dependency court, but they would say, you know, you cannot take your children there. And if you do, you know, we will have a social worker, and that reunification will be in danger. So I think about, I think about the children and the families. And I don't know what the answer is. And I don't know if you know what the answer would be. But if we, if we authorize encampments, I couldn't see that children and living on site. I think
we, I don’t know how that could be monitored, but I wouldn’t being comfortable if that was the case. I, I don’t know kind of conversation we could have in the future. About this. I know this is not the place to have all of what the conditions and the criteria will be, but that's one of my, one of my concerns.

>> Council member?

>> As far as the sweeps we do, and you prioritize those. Is it simply a call on the list, and you move down the list methodically? Or is there more to it? Just curious?

>> There’s more to it, council member. Typically, encampment abatement is prioritized by site, size, impact to the environment. We also have more specific focus along the waterways. Because of our agreement with the reasonable malwater quality control word and the discharge program that we operate. So we have core focus areas where we go on a routine basis. Story road. Telly. Areas along coyote, guadalupe and los gatos creek. We look at size, community, and potential impacts with the health and safety the people in the encampments and the surrounding community.

>> So then it's safe to say that not all of them are a call And referral from the community to remove or a complaint of the some of these are proactive on our side in terms of our obligations around the waterways of the.

>> Around the waterway, that would be true.

>> What about outside the waterways? Are any of those ones we sweep without a call?

>> I would say beyond the waterways, in terms of the city response, we’re very limited in our resources and what we have to respond. And we generally only do that on a community complaint basis. So the waterways specific focus will partner with county on sites, cal trans on sites on occasion, but we have very limited resources to do our own cleanups. We don’t have our own dump truck. So we’re very limited on our responses outside, outside of the waterways.

>> But do you respond to every request for an encampment clean up?
We do not. We conducted 450 to 500 cleanups in the last year, but we received 3700 calls on the hotline.

Some of those are probably the same sites.

There's definitely duplication or the same encampment called six or seven times over the course of a year, but we don't have the resources or the capacity with one team to respond to all the calls that we receive.

So you're saying generally outside of the waterways, we only respond on a complaint-driven basis.

Yeah, and on a complaint-driven basis and when we see significant community impact. Along city streets in downtown for instance. We don't have the resources to get one by one.

The ones by the waterways, probably my last question is. Those are we required to or you focus on those because you believe it's in the best interest of the waterways or the public benefit?

I won't speak outside of the annual stormwater permit requirement. So addressing the trash load as a result of encampment specifically is part of our stormwater permitting process.

It's only the trash component and the sanitation component.

Yeah. It's the direct discharge into the streams.

We also have a settlement with bay keeper which we have to live by.

And that covers --

Waterways.

Sanitation and garbage, yes.
>> Does is speak to the presence of people? And I now the Madison guys have been there.

>> I can't speak to the consent decree. The regional water quality control board drew a correlation in between the presence of people and encampments and direct discharge pollution. In the case of the story road, the jungle site. They said specifically they wanted the encampment moved from the area. The program looks at trash loads and the reduction of encampments over time. The goal is to reduce the number of encampments in a specific time.

>> What I was getting at, council member Jones spoke to it as far as the call from the constituent. Can you get rid of this encampment? We call, swept clean, moved, James or John a mile away calls me, there's now an encampment over here. And we call, Ted calls me a mile away after six months. There's an encampment here. So the point that we can do better, we all agree with that. But I don't now how that is any better, which is why I struggle with this issue. I don't think we believe and I've never heard from staff that after we sweep an encamp they pack their bags and move to other encampment in another part of the city. We're just cleaning up a particular area, which is why i was going down the line of complaint-driven or not, and is there a way we can mitigate the conditions we talk about as the biggest concerns, which are the sanitation and the garbage. And the dollars that we're spending, there might be an opportunity for us to provide those services whether it's porta potties and simply a dumpster. Simple as that. I know it's not as simple as that. But that's what's going through my hid. It has been going through my head for a while on this particular issue.

>> It was said earlier by one of my colleagues that, you know, encampments already happening whether we sanction them or not. I was trying to wrap my head around that. It's true. But help me understand. In a regime or regulatory scheme where we have sanctioned encampments, does that mean we have specific sites that you're allowed to camp at? Or is it open season anywhere in the city? You just pitch a tent?

>> Council member, generally, when you talk about sanctioned encampments, you have a specific site where it's authorized, frequently cities have some control over that site. People occupy it by permit. So they're like, you know, you are occupying this for a week. You agree to adhere to the behaviors, you continue to occupy it. That's how they traditionally have been
done. So the idea of like just providing some bathrooms, that's not traditionally considered a sanctioned encampment, at least in the terms of the cities who've had them long term.

>> So then to the extent that we have one or two or however many sanctioned sites throughout the city, would that then make the other current or preexisting camp, encampments just all around, would those be outlawed? In that sense?

>> Well, the sites really aren't legal now. They exist. They're not legal now. I don't think it would change their status at all.

>> I guess what I'm saying, the distinction in my mind is we have encampments already. Nobody denies that. We're kind of, we're doing sweeps to protect the waterways. When they get too close to industrial areas or residential areas we do the sweeps. We turn a blind eye by the tracks or areas where not too many people are complaining about. But when we have a sanctioned site, does that actively mean that we go out and we start, you know, actively cleaning up the streets where they're not sanctioned? Because now we have the site where you can go to, you better go over there or we're going to start going and sweeping?

>> We wouldn't have the capacity to do that. So that wouldn't be part of the program. So it's not only the trash, but as we saw in Oakland, one of the interesting things about Oakland was that's all they did originally. All think did was provide trash and restrooms, and what was really missing from the site was any kind of infrastructure or organization. And so what ended up happening was more people started coming to what was defined as their sanctioned encampment and they had no control over the people and no services. So it ended up getting out of control. And they had drug issues. And then ultimately these fires. So to make a sanctioned encampment more successful, we would have to do what we're proposing to do again for bridge communities. Which is having operational guidelines. So, to me, if we can't get bridge communities to work. We can't find a site. Just don't understand how we would get a sanction the community to work. We'd want to bring to the sanctioned encampment, hope for the best outcomes. The only outcome we would have is people living in a site that could potentially spiral out of control.

>> Let me ask a question too our city attorney. To the extent that the city assumes responsibility as having a sanctioned site, what is our duty of care?
Well, so, let me just respond to that. What we don't have under the sanctioned encampments is any of the exemptions for something that would exist under the mm we potentially have, there could be issues with depending on how it was structured. There are many grounds that people might find liability for the city. I think you've seen various letters threatening various kinds of actions and without being really specific, the less the site is managed the more potential there is for this liability to arise that the city would have to respond to.

As specifically, tort liability. We hand out water bottles, but for some reason the water is tainted, we get people sick.

In this case, the issue that comes up that you have to manage is dangerous condition to public property.

Okay.

So without trying to speculate too much on how that might arise, when you have tents, people frequently seek in winter months to provide themselves with heat. So you can imagine kind of some of the things that could come with this or some of the other issues if the site isn't actually managed in any shape or form. So these are, these are some of the issues that the memo attempts to sort of go through and talk about what sort of issues there are and what sort of things that we might want to have in place to manage that.

Sure. Thank you very much.

You're welcome.

Okay. I think we're all talked out. We've got a motion from council member Peralis. We're waiting, so we'll start the voting, we won't wrap up the voting until one of our members returns to the dais. So why don't we begin to vote now. And that motion, that motion passes. The meeting's adjourned.