



Memorandum

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: Mayor Sam Liccardo
Vice Mayor Carrasco
Councilmember Jones
Councilmember Perez
Councilmember Arenas

SUBJECT: ACTIONS RELATED TO THE
AB2176 BRIDGE HOUSING

DATE: August 25, 2017

APPROVED:

DATE: 08-25-2017

RECOMMENDATION

Direct the City Manager to:

1. Maintain the original Council direction of identifying potential sites for siting a Bridge Housing Community in each Council district.
2. To expand the potential inventory of sites for consideration, direct the City Manager to renew requests to other public agencies--specifically the County, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Valley Transportation Authority, and Caltrans--to identify underutilized lands in their inventories for potential use. Engage Council offices in those requests where specific sites appear promising.
3. The City Manager shall work with each Council Member to identify at least one viable, publicly owned site in their district for which the Councilmember is willing to support siting a "tiny homes" development, or alternatively, two or three sites which the Councilmember is willing to explore.
4. Return to City Council in 60 days with potential sites, and
 - a. prioritize the sites in order of viability and readiness for development.
 - b. return with a detailed community outreach plan. The plan should minimally include;
 - i. A small number of regional community meetings (e.g., North, South, East, West and Central San Jose) to begin the outreach process;
 - ii. Participation at each community meeting from the project designer, developer and program operator to provide details of tiny home prototype, program structure, security, operations, good neighbor plans, etc; and

- iii. Management of the meeting by an experienced professional facilitator, preferably a facilitator who will consider work on a pro-bono basis.
5. Seek Council approval to move forward demonstrate “proof of concept” with community outreach, planning and design of three or fewer bridge housing communities citywide first. Subsequent development of other sites should follow as sites become ready.
 6. Slightly revise the original evaluation criteria for potential sites to the following:
 - a. Access to transit *or commitment from another agency to provide transportation*;
 - b. Ready access to utilities (electricity, water and sanitary sewer);
 - c. A vacant or minimally developed site of at least 0.50 acres or a 10,000 square-foot building plus parking for 16 vehicles and a dumpster enclosure.

BACKGROUND

Residents justifiably have many concerns about how a homeless housing project could impact their neighborhood. Yet more than 4,000 homeless residents already live in our neighborhoods – in our streets, parks, and creeks. Living outside subjects each of those individuals—and the entire community-- to extraordinary risk of harm. Our neighborhoods will be far safer, cleaner, and more livable if these same individuals have housing.

The costs of homelessness come in many forms. The financial burden alone appears substantial: a 2013 report titled “Home Not Found: Cost of Homelessness Study in Silicon Valley” pegged the cost to the taxpayers at \$520 million per year countywide. Among those costs are the millions we spend in the City of San Jose to address residents’ concerns related to homelessness, including requests for encampment abatements, vehicle abatements, officer & ranger enforcement, and the deployment of outreach for homeless individuals. The FY16-17 cost for encampment abatements alone was just over \$1.9 million. The table below has information about homeless-related service requests per District:

Number of Homeless Concern Requests City-wide	
District	Since October 2016
1	94
2	309
3	850
4	280
5	299
6	467
7	638
8	78
9	473
10	299
Total	3,787

**Data provided by Housing Department*

Number of Encampments City-wide		
District	Total Number of Abatements in 2016	Total Number of Abatements from Jan – July 2017
1	20	6
2	15	17
3	166	115
4	22	13
5	38	24
6	65	52
7	220	160
8	9	9
9	15	7
10	16	15
Total	586	418

**Data provided by Housing Department*

Now more than ever, we must continue to explore every viable option to put more roofs over heads – including the implementation of interim housing options for our homeless population. AB2176 affords San Jose a unique opportunity to pilot the construction of temporary housing structures for homeless on public land. This type of project represents a promising and cost-effective strategy for rapidly housing some of our most vulnerable residents, restoring their dignity and putting them back on a path to self-sufficiency. Over the past year, we secured authority from the state, and identified funding for the project. Now, we just need to find the sites to build this type of housing.

All eyes look to San Jose to lead. We urge our colleagues to keep the Council’s commitment from June 28, 2017 by identifying a potential site in their district for consideration to pilot bridge housing. We need our partner agencies to step up as well, as requests for site identification have gone largely unheeded. Identifying a broader potential inventory of publicly-owned, underutilized lands will help minimize impacts on neighborhoods and maximize opportunities for housing. We understand Housing staff has engaged in promising discussions with the Water District on potential sites and we encourage expanded discussions with the County, Caltrans and Valley Transportation Authority.

We expect the City Manager to return in 60 days with a prioritized list of sites based objectively on the sites’ viability and readiness for development. We envision a process where we demonstrate a “proof of concept” for bridge housing communities on a small number of sites. We must demonstrate success through thorough community outreach, effective program operations, and well-enforced “good neighbor” policies before we can expect broader acceptance of this concept. For example, Seattle started with just 28 tiny homes on one site run by a nonprofit called the Low Income Housing Institute. After demonstrating success, two more “tiny home” sites were announced.

Most importantly, we direct staff to formulate a detailed community outreach and engagement strategy. We must not only allow for residents to provide input and participate, but we must also provide residents with crucial information about program guidelines and operations. This merely marks the beginning of many difficult conversations with our community about how and where

we can house our neediest residents in the City of San Jose. Our failure to successfully engage our community now will mean that our voters' approval of \$700 million of Measure A funding for homeless housing will go for naught.

Every neighborhood will become safer and healthier as we house our most vulnerable residents. Now is the time for our Council to demonstrate the leadership to bring our community together to confront this challenge.

BROWN ACT

The signers of this memorandum have not had, and will not have, any private conversation with any other member of the City Council, or that member's staff, concerning any action discussed in the memorandum, and that each signer's staff members have not had, and have been instructed not to have, any such conversation with any other member of the City Council or that member's staff.