



# Memorandum

**TO:** HONORABLE MAYOR  
AND CITY COUNCIL

**FROM:** Jacky Morales-Ferrand

**SUBJECT: BRIDGE HOUSING COMMUNITIES**

**DATE:** August 18, 2017

Approved

*D-DSyL*

Date

*8/18/17*

## RECOMMENDATION

- (a) Accept the staff report on a status update of the implementation of AB 2176 Bridge Housing Communities (BHC); and
- (b) Adopt a resolution approving the staff recommendation on the revised siting criteria for BHCs and reducing the number of BHCs from ten (10) sites to a maximum of two (2) locations.

## OUTCOME

Approval of this item will allow the Housing Department to set standard siting criteria for BHCs and modify the current Council direction to site and develop one BHC in each Council District. This action will create a more feasible scope and implementation plan, allowing the Housing Department and its partners to pilot and assess the overall effectiveness of the BHC project before considering expansion to additional sites.

## BACKGROUND

On September 27, 2016, AB 2176, authored by Assembly member Nora Campos, was signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown. Effective January 1, 2017, the bill amends the Shelter Crisis Act to authorize a five-year pilot program allowing the City of San José, upon a declaration of a shelter crisis and adoption of an ordinance establishing local standards, to create BHCs for the homeless. This includes temporary housing in new or existing structures on City-owned or City-leased property.

On October 4, 2016, the Housing Department provided the City Council with an information memorandum regarding the Work Plan for Implementing AB 2176. In that memorandum, staff indicated that the Department would pursue a series of actions outlined below to design and implement the BHC model.

## **Site Identification**

As part of a 9-1 motion at the June 28, 2016 City Council meeting, Council provided direction including a requirement that each Councilmember must propose and identify a site within their District where bridge housing communities, as defined by AB 2176, might ultimately be located. To assist Council, the Housing Department obtained a list of city-owned sites from the Office of Real Estate to identify potential sites for BHCs communities that met a minimum set of standards necessary to provide housing and services for up to 25 people at each site. These basic minimum standards included:

- Access to transit (ideally no further than ½-mile from a bus stop or LRT transit station);
- Ready access to utilities (electricity, water, and sanitary sewer);
- A vacant or minimally developed (i.e., paving only) site of at least 0.50 acres; or
- A 10,000 square-foot building plus parking for 16 vehicles and a dumpster enclosure.

Staff met with all Council offices to review the list and to discuss potential options in their districts. On April 12, 2017, staff presented the City-owned site list to the Neighborhood Commission to discuss community outreach strategies to all Districts. As a result of the Commission meeting, Housing Department staff started to work to schedule meetings with small groups of neighborhood leaders in each District. The goal of these meetings was to obtain feedback and identify neighborhood concerns in small focus group settings about the program and the potential locations before outreaching to the broader community. To date, the Department has met with groups in seven (7) Districts.

Through the outreach process, staff received considerable input regarding locations on the list of City-owned properties from neighborhood associations, community action groups, environmental organizations, and a number of concerned citizens. Concerns ranged from possible noise, safety, and traffic impacts for adjacent residential parcels to potential environmental impacts. Staff evaluated this feedback and determined the need for additional criteria to consider when vetting potential sites, including:

- 100-foot setback from adjacent residential uses (measured from parcel line to nearest BHC building);
- 150-foot buffer from schools and neighborhood parks (measured from parcel line to nearest buffered use); and
- 100-foot setback from major creeks and tributaries and their riparian corridors (measured from the nearest BHC building to the tree drip-line).

Staff released an information memorandum on July 27, 2017, and applied this new criteria to the existing City-owned property list. As a result, of the 99 properties initially identified on the revised list (**Attachment A**), only four (4) locations remain as sites that could potentially host a BHC.

### **BHC Design Process**

In early 2017, the Housing Department was approached by the Gensler architecture firm with an offer to provide, on a *pro bono* basis, a design process for the emergency sleeping cabins (ESC) that are allowable in BHCs. Gensler is a world-wide company with 30 offices in the United States and 16 more around the world.

The design process included a series of meetings held by Gensler called Visioning Workshops. Program attendees included city staff, housing advocates, nonprofit partners, and several Gensler architects and designers. The goal of these sessions was to clarify and understand project objectives of the BHC program. Issues discussed included space requirements, image, budget, schedule, planning concepts and strategies as they relate to existing and future facilities. These interactive sessions helped to set a clear direction for the program.

Following the session, Gensler coordinated a participative Design Charrette in June of 2017. This activity included Housing Department representatives, representatives of end users (i.e. homeless individuals), homeless services providers, design students from San Jose State University, representatives from the Neighborhoods Commission, and the Gensler's design team. Results from this process included two initial designs for the ESCs and a generic site design for a BHC. It is anticipated that the final designs will be completed by September, with prototype ESCs being delivered later in the fall.

### **BHC Developer and Operator Selection**

The Housing Department issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to find a developer and/or operator for the BHCs on January 13, 2017. Four responses to the RFQ were received by the March 8, 2017 deadline and were reviewed by a panel that included staff from Housing Department and the County's Office of Supportive Housing. Three of the four respondents were selected as qualified partners through the process, including:

- Habitat for Humanity – Developer;
- HomeFirst – Operator; and
- LifeMoves – Operator/Developer

(Through this selection process, these organizations have been identified as qualified partners that may be awarded contracts to partner or work independently on the development and operation of a BHC site.)

## **ANALYSIS**

Over the past five (5) years, the Housing Department and its partners have made significant strides in addressing homelessness in the community, with over 500 permanent supportive housing opportunities funded and in some stage of development. Despite this progress, meeting the immediate housing needs of homeless men, women, and children remains a challenge. The 2017 Homeless Census found that there are still 4,350 homeless individuals in San José on a given night; 74 percent of the population were unsheltered and 28% were identified as being chronically homeless.

AB 2176 represents one potential option of providing interim housing with greater safety and dignity than living on street. The flexibility of the new law created an innovative tool to adopt local building, health, and safety codes and temporarily remove zoning issues, giving the City the opportunity to develop cost effective housing quickly and consider a variety of sites and locations for the communities. Since the effective date of law, staff has worked through several processes that have provided important insights from stakeholders and the public regarding both the benefits and challenges of this conceptual approach as described below.

### **Design**

The visioning and design process facilitated by Gensler, which has focused specifically on the design of the sleeping cabins, has provided a strong focus on creating cost-effective, livable spaces for unhoused residents. The community participants in this process identified a set of core principles to guide the effort to ensure a safe, secure, and sustainable environment that aligns with the social, economic, and environmental goals of the surrounding communities. Participants stated that the project should blend into the surrounding setting through a progressive design that is vitalizing, dignified, respectful, and humble.

Since no final designs have been completed or presented, the community provided general comments on the design concept. Residents expressed concerns about the lack of bathroom facilities, quality of the structures, cost, livability of the cabins and the appropriateness of placing individuals into such a small structure. They expressed concern that the design itself and size of the cabins would force homeless people into the surrounding neighborhood because of the lack of space.

The final design elements will include elements of durability, affordability, safety, and reusability. Currently, Gensler is working on finalizing a set of designs based on this process that will be completed in the fall. The goal is to construct up to two prototypes to showcase the designs so that both residents and end-users will have an opportunity to tour and provide feedback before the structure goes into final production. Construction of the prototypes will be completed by a developer partner selected through the RFQ.

## **Operations**

Proposed operating standards for BHCs, first identified in proposals submitted through the developer/operator RFQ, provided a general blueprint for site operations. The HomeFirst proposal specifically presented a plan developed by an experienced operations team that included architects, urban planners, homeless advocates, and nonprofit providers. HomeFirst focused on BHCs providing a safe and supportive environment for clients to receive a comprehensive array of services that will help them reintegrate into society, increase their self-sufficiency, and successfully transition into permanent housing.

During community outreach, members of the public echoed these concepts, but shared more concerns about the necessity for 24-hour security, onsite case management, and the infrastructure required to meet the clients' basic needs. Community members also inquired about screening criteria, who exactly will be allowed to enter the site, offenses that could lead to exiting clients from the program, and site rules. Most of the comments from the public focused on the need for the City to structure the sites so that the site operations would not have detrimental impacts on the surrounding community, property values, and the need to have a process in place to address any community members' concerns immediately.

The Department will return to Council to seek authorization for contracts for both the developer and the operators selected through the RFQ process. This will allow the operator to begin the process of working on the management structure and operating standards for the BHC.

## **Siting**

With feedback stemming primarily from the list of City-owned properties, staff have received the vast majority of all public comments in meetings, over the phone, and via email related to the siting of BHCs. More specifically, residents rejected the specific sites located in their neighborhoods. Residents expressed that the sites should be located far away from schools, parks, and residential neighborhoods. Some residents shared concerns about the potential environmental impact of BHCs and stated that it must be fully considered when selecting a location. Many residents also expressed concerns that the locations would attract new homeless individuals to the area in addition to creating quality of life impacts. The overwhelming consensus from residents was that the sites should be located away from any activated park or residential use.

Despite progress with both the design process and the competitive selection of a developer and operator, the identification of viable sites for BHCs remains a considerable challenge. The original vision of the project was to use the flexibility of the AB 2176 to consider as many potential locations as possible, while also assessing the feasibility of integrating small bridge housing communities in Districts throughout the City. The initial goal was to avoid physical isolation and segregation of the communities; however, after an overwhelming public response from neighborhood residents, it became apparent that additional siting criteria would be needed to adequately address community concerns.

The new criteria, included in the July 27, 2017 information memorandum was provided to Council to address various issues by incorporating similar standards used for the recently created amendment to Title 20 permitting incidental shelters in assembly uses with additional environmental protections such as aligning mandatory development setbacks with the existing Council Riparian Corridor Protection Policy. These new standards respond to the neighborhood concerns and provide buffering and separation for the surrounding community. Staff is also recommending the removal of the site in Council District 7 because accessing the site will require the construction of a costly bridge. This leaves three city-owned sites on the list of potentially viable sites. Further, AB 2176 does not exempt the City from CEQA and the review process could potentially eliminate additional sites from the list.

### **Recommendation on Next Steps**

Given the limited options currently available and the direction of Council to identify one site in each district, staff has continued to reach out to partners such as the County of Santa Clara and the Santa Clara Valley Water District to review any additional surplus land. Neither agency has provided any specific locations to date, though the Water District and the County have expressed interest in continuing to look for options. In addition, staff has received a number of suggested sites from the general public, but the majority of the recommendations are privately-owned and require additional time and resources to fully explore.

Beyond the absence of a sufficient number of viable sites to meet Council direction, the question of partner capacity is also a significant issue. The providers selected through the City's RFQ process have indicated that the opening and operation of ten (10) sites across the City at the same time could pose significant planning and staffing issues for their organizations. Ramping up to fully build out and develop all locations simultaneously, coupled with the case management, security, and infrastructure needs of each site, would require significant upfront operating capital and the hiring of a number of new employees for organizations engaged in the work. Given stakeholder feedback received to date, the consideration of 24-hour security, onsite case management, and an array of client resources are all necessities and could significantly increase the annual cost of operations at each BHC locations. While the budgets have not been finalized yet, staff estimates that each site could require up to \$300,000 to construct 20 sleeping cabins and up to \$600,000 to fund the necessary infrastructure, including community space, shower and restroom facilities, lighting, parking and other site preparation. In addition, a high level of services and security could set annual operating costs at approximately \$500,000 per site.

Given the unique nature of the project and the number of variables present, staff recommends moving forward with a pilot project at up to a maximum of two (2) locations. A pilot project of one year allows the City to assess annual operating costs, review potential impacts, and study the programmatic effectiveness. It also allows a small cohort of participants to test the livability of the newly designed sleeping cabins and ensure the structures are durable and meet the various needs of the residents and the surrounding community. Following this one-year pilot, staff would

return to Council with the results and offer recommendations for next steps which could include expanding, maintaining, or terminating the program.

To proceed with this course of action, staff recommends that Council accept the revised siting criteria and reduce the number of BHCs from ten (10) sites to a maximum of two (2) locations, initially. This will allow staff to narrow the search parameters and continue to study more locations throughout the City, especially in Districts where little or no other interim or permanent homeless housing opportunities currently exist. If approved, staff will continue to work to identify additional locations for the next several weeks, engaging partners at the County, the Water District, and any other entity able to provide the City with temporary use of land. Staff will also investigate other options where the law's zoning and land use flexibility could be applied such as underutilized motels or vacant commercial space (e.g. warehouses).

### **Outreach and Public Engagement**

The Housing Department began the public outreach process by focusing on smaller meetings to listen to neighborhood concerns. Once the selected developer and operator are under contract, a sample site plan and operations plan has been completed, and the design of the sleeping cabins has been completed, staff will initiate a community outreach process to gather community input and feedback. Staff will schedule and notice five (5) large public meetings (two night meetings, two day meetings, and one weekend meeting) at locations throughout the City. Staff will also plan a separate public meeting to display and discuss the completed sleeping cabin prototype(s). Once specific sites are identified and have been screened to ensure they meet the minimum siting criteria, staff will work with the Council offices to host targeted outreach meetings near the proposed BHC locations. Residents and businesses located within 1000 feet of the proposed site will be notified of the public meeting. Upon the completion of the community process and the CEQA review, staff will return to Council with a recommendation for up to two (2) locations.

The Housing Department has created a website to provide the community with information and updates on the workplan. Interested persons can subscribe to the site to receive email updates as well as information posted on the site.

### **EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP**

If approved, the Housing Department will return to Council with recommended actions to fund and implement BHCs at specific locations. In addition, the City Council would consider the enactment of a shelter crisis, as defined under AB 2176, and the adoption of an ordinance, containing local building, safety, and other standards required by the law.

This memorandum is not recommending or suggesting any specific sites or locations at this time, and, as noted earlier, required environmental review will be a part of any development process.

## **POLICY ALTERNATIVES**

Housing Department staff considered the following alternative:

**Alternative #1:**        *Reject staff changes to siting criteria and the minimum number required BHCs.*

**Pros:**                Rejecting the proposed changes by staff would allow more flexibility in siting, increasing the number of viable sites. This increased flexibility could provide staff with the ability to successfully site a BHC in each Council District, with additional time and resources.

**Cons:**                The proposed siting criteria relate directly to ordinances designed to provide buffers from existing surrounding uses. Not implementing those recommended buffers could create adverse impacts to adjacent properties and uses.

Rejecting the modified number of sites proposed by staff could create significant internal and external capacity issues and may require the commitment of considerable additional resources to secure and develop the sites.

**Reason for not  
Recommending:**    Given the challenges raised by partner organizations, the absence of data related to this new initiative, and the community feedback received to date, siting, developing and operating ten (10) sites simultaneously exceeds staff capacity and could lead to negative outcomes.

## **PUBLIC OUTREACH**

This memorandum will be posted on the City's Council Agenda website for the August 29, 2017 Council Meeting.

## **COORDINATION**

Preparation of this report has been coordinated with the Office of the City Attorney and the City Manager's Budget Office.

HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL  
August 18, 2017  
**Subject: Bridge Housing Communities**  
Page 9

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION/INPUT**

The Housing and Community Development Commission did not hear this item as it was assigned to the Neighborhood Commission for assistance on community outreach. Neighborhood Commissioners have been organizing public outreach meetings with leadership representatives in the District for initial feedback on AB 2176.

**CEQA**

Not a Project, File No. PP10-069(a), Staff Report.

/s/  
JACKY MORALES-FERRAND  
Director of Housing

For questions, please contact Ray Bramson, Acting Deputy Director, at (408) 535-8234.

Attachment A: City Owned-Sites

# City-Owned Sites

ATTACHMENT A

Dist.	APN	Property Location	Imp Type 1	Sq Ft	Acres	#	Site Issues / Comments
01	381-19-025	S/s Williams Rd, approx. 350' E of Moorpark	Vacant Land	25,000	0.57	1	Need to clear trees/vegetation
	403-38-001	NE corner Quito & Westmont	Vacant Land	14,325	0.33	1	No residential use setback
	N/A	Former Westmont ROW btwn Westmont & Halifax	Vacant Lane	13,440	0.31	1	No residential use setback
02	679-02-013	N/s Silver Creek Valley Rd opp. Piercy Rd	Vacant btwn pumps	30,000	0.68	1	Remote from transit
	678-08-056	W/s Hellyer Ave, Nly of Silicon Valley Blvd	Vacant Land	10,998	0.25	1	Remote from transit
	678-08-049	W/s Hellyer Ave, Nly of Silicon Valley Blvd	Vacant Land	65,775	1.51	1	Remote from transit
	678-08-047	W/s Hellyer Ave, Nly of Silicon Valley Blvd	Vacant Land	127,630	2.93	1	Remote from transit
	678-08-044	W/s Hellyer Ave, Nly of Silicon Valley Blvd	Vacant Land	40,075	0.92	1	Remote from transit
	678-08-036	W/s Hellyer Ave, Nly of Silicon Valley Blvd	Vacant Land	229,125	5.26	1	Remote from transit
	678-08-033	W/s Hellyer Ave, Nly of Silicon Valley Blvd	Vacant Land	85,621	1.97	1	Remote from transit
	678-03-036	E/s Monterey, N/s Bernal (inside ramp loop)	Vacant Land	112,050	2.57	1	Meets criteria
	678-02-035	Basking Ridge Av	Vacant Land	1.393M	31.99	1	Too steep; no access
	676-81-005	Dove Hill Rd at Deans Place Wy, SE corner	Freeway/street	14,810	0.34	1	Under fwy or frontage road
	725-01-023	E/s Monterey Rd between Kirby and Burnett Aves	Vacant Land		72.73	1	No services (in Coyote Valley)
03	472-27-106	Reed St, E, btwn 3rd St, S, & 4th St, S	Vacant Land	10,454	0.24	1	Too small
	434-26-037	Almaden Road, 1527	Vacant Land	78,408	1.80	1	Park Development Site
	265-25-126	Woz Wy	Street	36,360	0.83	1	Is Museum Pkwy or is under Woz Way
	264-41-087	Fuller Av, N side, btwn Bird Av & Delmas Av	Park	23,522	0.54	1	Park Development Site
	264-41-066	Bird Av at Fuller Av, NE corner	Vacant Land	7,405	0.17	1	Too small
	264-26-100	Woz Wy	Street	14,054	0.32	1	Under Woz Way
	264-25-128	Woz Wy	Street	14,550	0.33	1	Under Woz Way
	264-25-127	Woz Wy	Street	16,553	0.39	1	Under Woz Way
	259-35-026	Santa Teresa St at Carlisle St, NE corner	Vacant Land	6,534	0.15	1	Too small
	259-29-098	Julian St, W, S side, E of Autumn St, N	Vacant Land	6,486	0.15	1	Too small
	259-22-062	Coleman at Guadalupe River	Freeway	10,890	0.25	1	Part of Guadalupe River parkway
	259-22-029	Clayton Av, S side, E of 87 Fwy/Guadalupe Py	Vacant Land	1,307	0.03	1	Too small
	259-08-102	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		4.30	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-08-098	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.67	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-07-113	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		5.23	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-06-067	E/s Guadalupe Fwy frontage road, N/s Taylor St	Vacant Land		1.09	1	Meets criteria
	259-06-065	Guadalupe frontage road	Creek/trail	(blank)	(blank)	1	Part of Guadalupe River parkway
	259-05-078	Old San Pedro Street at Mission	Vacant Land	12,197	0.28	1	Too small
	259-05-048	San Pedro St at Taylor St, NE corner	Vacant Land	3,920	0.09	1	Too small
	259-04-019	87 Fwy/Guadalupe Py at Mission St, W, SE corner	Parking lot	28,314	0.65	1	City employee parking lot
259-04-007	Guadalupe frontage road	Freeway	25,260	0.58	1	Under freeway	
259-03-141	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.29	1	Airport Approach Zone	

Dist.	APN	Property Location	Imp Type 1	Sq Ft	Acres	#	Site Issues / Comments
	259-03-142	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		5.23	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-03-136	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land			1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-03-035	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land			1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-02-131	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.19	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-02-130	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.67	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-02-129	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		1.64	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-02-128	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.67	1	Airport Approach Zone
	259-02-115	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		1.84	1	Airport Approach Zone
	249-65-102	Nly terminus of West Court	Park	10,675	0.24	1	Park Development Site
	249-47-018	6th St, N, W side, btwn Empire St, E & Washington St	Vacant Land	4,356	0.10	1	Too small
	230-39-133	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.28	1	Airport Approach Zone
	230-39-129	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.67	1	Airport Approach Zone
	230-39-124	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		3.67	1	Airport Approach Zone
	230-38-111	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		1.92	1	Airport Approach Zone
	230-38-092	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		0.43	1	Airport Approach Zone
	230-28-080	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		2.85	1	Airport Approach Zone
	230-38-076	Bounded by Rte 880, Rte 87, Taylor & Coleman	Vacant Land		0.42	1	Airport Approach Zone
	230-21-078	Sherwood Av, SW side, at intersection with Hamline S	Vacant Land	420	0.01	1	Too small
04	595-31-001	Noble Av, 14630	SFD + vacant Land	165,528	3.80	1	No residential use setback
	595-24-055	S/s Noble Av, 100' E of Mira Vista	Vacant Land	74,050	1.70	1	No residential use setback
	245-27-021	Sierra Rd at Lundy Av, NW corner	Vacant Land	2,757	0.06	1	Too small
	244-03-001	Fallingtree Dr, W side, btwn Flickinger Av & Olive Tree	Vacant Land	2,040	0.05	1	Too small
	015-44-013	S/s Grand Blvd btwn Archer St & Disk Dr	Vacant Land	280,000	6.42	1	Under PG&E high tension line
	015-43-023	SE corner Grand Blvd & Trinity Park Dr	Vacant Land	(blank)	0.40	1	Park Development Site
	015-43-022	SW corner Grand Blvd & Trinity Park Dr.	Vacant Land	(blank)	0.28	1	Too small
	015-30-070	Grand Bl, E side, N of Los Esteros Rd	WPCP outflow	185,566	4.26	1	Outflow channel from sewage plant
	015-30-061	Hwy 237, N of, E of Artesian Slough	Vacant Land	454,330	10.43	1	Salt marsh
	015-30-058	Los Esteros Rd, N side, E of Grand Bl	WPCP	137,535	3.16	1	Part of sewage treatment plant
	015-12-032	Essex St at State St, SW Corner	Vacant Land	3,000	0.07	1	Too small
	015-11-006	State St at Essex St, NE Corner	Vacant Land	2,953	0.07	1	Too small
05	481-39-013	N/s Story Rd, 800' W of King (on Knox Ave)	Vacant Land	65,000	1.50	1	Park development site
	481-21-114	Saron Av, W side, btwn Sunset Ct & Lausett Av	Vacant Land	380	0.01	1	Too small
06	455-31-055	Evans Ln, E side, btwn Almaden Rd & Almaden Ex	Vacant Land	40,946	0.94	1	Interim housing development site
	455-31-053	Evans Ln, E side, btwn Almaden Rd & Almaden Ex	Vacant Land	217,364	4.99	1	Interim housing development site
	434-11-034	Almaden Av at Alma Av, W, SW corner	Vacant Land	15,246	0.35	1	Too small
	264-48-119	Fuller Ave	Vacant Land	786	0.02	1	Too small
	264-46-179	Bird Av at Atlanta Av, SE corner	Vacant Land	3,485	0.08	1	Too small
	264-43-078	Bird Av, W side, btwn Fuller St & West Virginia St	Vacant Land	29,040	0.67	1	No access
	264-42-001	Auzerais Av at Hannah St, SW Corner	Vacant Land	6,098	0.14	1	Too small
	264-15-022	San Carlos St, W, S side, W of Royal Av	Vacant Land	1,307	0.03	1	Too small

Dist.	APN	Property Location	Imp Type 1	Sq Ft	Acres	#	Site Issues / Comments
	264-11-109	Auzerais	Park	98,010	2.25	1	Park development Site
	261-37-030	San Carlos St, W, N side, W of Montgomery St	Vacant Land	5,286	0.12	1	Too small
	259-46-097	Park Av, 460	Vacant Land	12,234	0.28	1	Too small
07	499-35-001	NW corner Tuers Rd & Capitol Expwy	Vacant Land	60,000	1.38	1	Insufficient environmental setback
	477-20-161	Wool Creek Dr	Vacant Land	565,844	12.99	1	Meets criteria, but access across creek is problematic
	477-12-003	W/s Roberts Ave opp. Vintage Way	Vacant Land	435,600	10.00	1	Park Development Site
	472-12-073	Story Rd, N of Senter	Vacant Land	(blank)	(blank)	1	Environmental Restoration Site
	472-11-081	Story Rd, N of, W of Remillard Ct	Vacant Land	(blank)	(blank)	1	Environmental Restoration Site
	472-11-062	Story Rd, N side, btwn Remillard Ct & Union Pacific R	Vacant Land	463,914	10.65	1	Environmental Restoration Site
	472-11-055	Story Rd, N of, W of Remillard Ct	Vacant Land	88,862	2.04	1	Environmental Restoration Site
	472-11-054	Story Rd, N of, W of Remillard Ct	Vacant Land	744,440	17.09	1	Environmental Restoration Site
	472-11-009	Story Rd, N side, W of Union Pacific Railroad	Vacant Land	564,973	12.97	1	Environmental Restoration Site
	472-11-003	Story Rd, N side, W of Remillard Ct	Vacant Land	235,660	5.41	1	Environmental Restoration Site
08	679-14-003	SE/s Yerba Buena Rd opp. Chisin St.	Vacant Land		9.00	1	Creek easement + too steep
	660-49-031	NE cor San Felipe Rd & Early Morning Lane	Vacant Land		2.51	1	Too steep; miles from transit service
	660-49-005	E/s Running Springs Rd opp. Hawk Crest Circle	Vacant Lane		4.03	1	Too steep; miles from transit service
	660-46-016	NW corner Running Springs Rd & Grand Oak Way	Vacant Lane		2.36	1	Too steep; miles from transit service
	660-36-001	N/s Running Springs Rd opp. Skywalker Dr.	Vacant Lane		3.95	1	Too steep; miles from transit service
	659-48-112	Etruscan Dr at Alessandro Dr, NW corner	Vacant Land	3,215	0.07	1	Too small
	659-48-111	Aborn Rd at Alessandro Dr, SE corner	Vacant Land	5,891	0.14	1	Too small
	659-48-085	Aborn Rd at Alessandro Dr, SW corner	Vacant Land	4,244	0.10	1	Too small
9	459-13-024	W/s Thousand Oaks Dr. opp. 1,000 Oaks Park	Vacant Land	81,020	1.86	1	Insufficient neighborhood park buffer
10	N/A	Excess Branham Lane ROW, Wly of Monterey Rd	Vacant Land	67,500	1.55	1	Meets criteria
	694-02-002	NE cor Almaden Expwy & Coleman Ave	Vacant Land		1.61	1	Insufficient environmental setback
	583-69-001	E/s Falcon Knoll Ct. & Falcon Ridge Ct.	Vacant Land		18.80	1	Too steep
Grand Total						99	