CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2016

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLISHED AGENDA

From: Sherman Lewis [mailto:] **On Behalf Of** Sherman
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 11:40 PM
To: List-Mayor-Council
Subject: shuttles

Quick Comments on Shuttle Feasibility

I don't have time to do a careful job with these comments. Basically, my approach is totally different from the one Council is pursuing, and I don't think your approach makes sense. Infrequent service on loop routes and in low density suburban areas cannot attract enough riders to make it worthwhile.

First of all, you have no operational definition of "under-served." You are ignoring how the rest of the world does it; you are using survey data that ignores costs and characteristics of riders. You don't have the basic information needed or the policy framework necessary to make transit cost-effective. As a result you are likely to be as successful as AC Transit in wasting money on empty buses.

The claim that corridors west of Hesperian and east of Mission are less adequately served seems to me simply incorrect. It overlooks the fact that the four lines already on the west side and the five on the east side do a good job of coverage and have few riders. Regional connectivity has the same problem—reasonably good service and low ridership. See http://www.actransit.org/pdf/maps/version_28/city_map.pdf

The problem is that these areas are dispersed and inherently poor for fixed route scheduled service.

The report has no information on how much subsidy AC Transit has per rider or per passenger mile, or about bus operating cost per revenue hour. Does Council have any idea how much we are paying people to ride buses in Hayward? What is the fare box recovery excluding capital costs? Have you compared the FTA data on AC Transit with Union City

Transit? These questions are fundamental before considering new service. The FTA has guidelines about new service relating to cost per new rider. Are you going to do that calculation?

I don't understand comments about the lack of connectivity. A glance at the AC map shows great connectivity around Hayward BART; it is one of the major inter-modal stations in the Bay Area. A dense network of bus lines brings people to BART. The M Line provides Transbay service. Hayward BART has 15 lines coming into it and South Hayward BART has seven lines coming into it. The Amtrak station is served by three lines on A St. and one on B St. Few people ride Amtrak from Hayward and there are few trains.

Three of the four neighborhood areas cited have good bus service.

Businesses are going to tell you that transit would be helpful. Everybody will tell you more transit is nice. The more meaningful question is how much businesses are willing to pay for more transit.

What does the report mean by "limitations of existing transit service levels"? Empty buses mean the service levels are higher than demand even at a highly subsidized fare. It would probably be more cost-effective to provide paratransit on-demand ride sharing services, and that should be studied before thinking about new service. I don't know who the respondents were in the residential and business communities, but I do know I would want to know if they rode buses or just imagined other people riding buses.

I need to see the documentation and model runs data before I know what is going on. I would not trust models run by Fehr and Peers, a technically excellent firm with no larger frame of policy reference and quite happy to put a technical gloss on what the city wants to hear. Fehr and Peers are the ones who decided Cal State needed a parking structure without considering if travel demand management and the Beeline Bus could do the job. HAPA had far more data and did a much more comprehensive analysis than they did. (I don't blame Ellen Poling entirely; the CSU consultant and the CSU administrator in charge were incompetent in this area of policy.)

Council has trusted simplistic modeling the past and assumes that the numbers are over your heads. You can, actually, understand how models work, but it takes time. I need time to review model strengths and weaknesses. The first thing I would do is see if the model can predict ridership on the existing AC lines. When it has been calibrated to reality, it should not be tweaked to get some preordained result. We've had 20 years of bad modeling by MTC—not bad technically but bad systemically—used to justify more and more investment in transit with decades of declining ridership. The consultants who make money telling Councils what they want to hear live in a totally different world from the academics who study reality. I have explained to Council the problems with 4 step models in the past, but it doesn't seem to penetrate. You should at least see if Fehr and Peers have upgraded to household-based activity models like San Diego's.

I would study the potential of using travel diaries of the target populations to see if their travel time to purpose pattern would be improved by new service and if there were enough riders. I would ask people on the low ridership routes what they thought could be improved. I would not lend much credence to support for transit from people not willing to pay for it.

The failure of transit in the U.S.—it is not just a Hayward problem—is a result of our car culture, which likes transit without understanding its systemic context. Look at Europe, Curitiba, Bogota, Asian cities—even Toronto—to see how it should be done. I'm talking here about suburban bus service; the U.S. has some good urban rail, and bus service in old central cities like San Francisco and Oakland is a totally different issue. The problem is the overlay of "transit" in suburban areas without the pricing, auto management, and corridor densification that are essential for functionality.

If you really feel the need to improve transit, keep three things in mind: the corridor distance must be short to provide frequent service with one or two buses, use rapid bus concepts, and the corridor must have densification through development along the lines of the policies in Walking Oriented Development. It would take a work session to explain the ideas.

It makes no sense for Council to study shuttles on the one hand and on the other to build six story parking structures next to downtown. It makes no sense to support shuttles and have the pedestrian-hostile loop surrounding downtown with high speed traffic. Council's thinking is really incoherent, similar to many other cities. Without a systemic approach, you are failing the future. With it, Hayward can become a national leader.

There is very little information in the staff report and attachments, but it is clear the shuttles do not use rapid bus concepts and have frequencies and routes that imitate AC Transit. The routes meander like AC's and overlap them.

I see three potential services but only if rapid bus concepts are used and reinforced by the other walking-oriented development policies. They are BART to Lincoln Landing, BART to CSUEB Hayward, and BART to County Center, Southland, and Chabot, in that order due to increasing distance and cost. The downtown shuttle is .7 miles long, with rapid bus taking 5 minutes, allowing 6 minute headway with one bus.

I did a quick look at the numbers:

Shuttles						
route	Winton	Tennyson	S. Industrial	Foothill Cannery	Fairway Park	Stonebrae
hours	6	6	6	6	6	6
headway	15	15	15	15	15	15
distance	10.6	11.5	6	4.5	12.5	10.2
# buses	3	3	2	2	4	3
riders/hr	18	23	19	15	5	10
cost	982	682	460	460	905	682
total boardings	323	419	227	184	242	214
cost per rider. Operating only	$ 1.20	$ 0.64	$ 0.80	$ 0.99	$ 1.48	$ 1.26
per mile half distance	$ 0.06	$ 0.03	$ 0.07	$ 0.11	$ 0.06	$ 0.06
duplicates AC #	83, 86, 386	83	85, SB, 97	83, 85, 37, 93, 48	99, 801	94
	loop route	loop route	loop route	loop route	long distance low density	long distance low density
cost per operating hour	$ 21.56	$ 14.98	$ 15.15	$ 15.15	$ 14.90	$ 14.98
idle time	6	6	6	6	6	6
Idle time: buses should get patronage from about 7 or 8 am to 7 or 8 pm, 12 hours, and anything less is idle time for the capital investment.						

The idle time is long for the capital involved. AC Transit keeps its buses running more hours. Did the model estimate the reduction in riders on AC Transit? Are you going to explore working with AC Transit to change their service where their similar line has low patronage?

What will be the compensation for drivers? Will you want a unionized operator or not? The question arises because my estimate of your cost per operating hour is that it is way too low, even below Union City's. You should ask for the estimate for bus operating cost per revenue hour.

By and large the data before Council is too skimpy for me to analyze. My analyses of these issues require a lot data on how the model works, calibration, costs, etc. My proposals for downtown have been ignored, but include a fast, frequent, free shuttle linking BART to Lincoln Landing. Imitation of the AC Transit model works poorly. You should study short corridors with densification and alternative transportation as a systemic

solution that makes sense economically and environmentally. Only a few places—New York, Portland, San Francisco—seem to be doing this.

Sherman Lewis

CITY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2016

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AT MEETING


MEXICAN
FOOD
Los Compadres
RESTAURANT
TORTILLA FACTORY
Los Compadres

Koch brothers network ready to oppose Trump

By Jonathan Swan / THE HILL / Monday, February 1, 2016

INDIAN WELLS, Calif. – Donald Trump is so fiercely opposed by the Koch brothers network that some donors believe the powerful group will intervene to stop the billionaire if it looks like he could win the Republican presidential nomination.

"They are always very hesitant to get involved in a primary but I think if they were going to do it this would be the time because they just hate the guy," said a donor who attended the Koch network's winter retreat, held over the weekend at a luxury resort near the foothills of Palm Springs's Coachella Valley.

Both officials and donors within the powerful group hope the real estate tycoon's White House bid dies a natural death so the group can avoid spending a penny of its $889 million 2016 cycle budget against him. But the Koch network's conversations over the weekend concerning what to do about Trump were more detailed than previously revealed.

On the eve of the Iowa causes, Koch network officials revealed in a private meeting with donors that they had commissioned focus group research to identify Trump's vulnerabilities.

And some influential figures in the group — which held its largest gathering ever, with 500 donors attending the weekend gathering — believe that a decision on how to deal with Trump would need to be taken if he emerges dominant out of the New Hampshire, where he holds a commanding lead in polls.

During a private planning session on Sunday morning, a senior Koch official ran through every presidential candidate, analyzing their strengths and weaknesses, said a source who attended the session.

When he got to Trump, the tone shifted. Trump, the official said, has been on the opposite side of nearly every issue the Koch group cares about, such as taxes, trade, and corporate welfare.

"There's also a Constitutional piece," the same donor added. "The president's job isn't to go up there and be a Caesar-like figure."

The Koch official shared for the first time focus group research the network had commissioned showing that Trump's popularity falls when voters are shown how working people have suffered as a result of his bankruptcies and business dealings in Atlantic City. Stories of ordinary people's livelihoods being harmed as Trump tried to enrich himself at their expense are most effective in "moving the needle" against Trump, donors were told.

Several older donors spoke passionately against the billionaire in the private session, and only one donor in the room made a half-hearted attempt to defend him.

Making an enemy of the Koch network is dangerous for any Republican politician. The group, founded by billionaire industrialists Charles and David Koch, comprises about 700 donors who give more than $100,000 annually to maintain their membership.

The network has resources and technology rivaling the Republican Party's infrastructure and spent close to $400 million in 2015 on its goals to minimize the role of government in people's lives. But it also intervenes in electoral politics and will play a multimillion-dollar role in the 2016 presidential and Senate races.

The Koch network is holding off on endorsing a 2016 presidential nominee, though has narrowed its preferences down to five acceptable candidates: Rubio, Cruz, Bush, Rand Paul and Carly Fiorina.

A number of donors have been turned off of Bush recently, though, angered by the former Florida governor's super-PAC, which spent some $20 million attacking Rubio, who aligns with the Koch network on many of its issues.

These donors wonder why the super-PAC didn't spend more of his $100 million-plus haul attacking Trump.

Some Koch donors are refreshed by Trump's style and his willingness to reject political correctness and speak his mind. But his past support for tax increases, universal healthcare and other liberal agenda items mean they matter believe he cannot be trusted no

what he says now.

"You have to judge Trump on his past statements, and while it's clear he's been on two sides of nearly every issue, the one side he's never been on is our side," said the donor who attended the session but asked not to be named. The conversations were held in a setting that was closed to the small number of press allowed into the resort, which the Koch network rented out in its entirety and stocked with heavy security to prevent infiltration.

Six news outlets, including The Hill, agreed to ground rules in order to cover the event, including not naming donors unless they gave permission.

Trump's support for ethanol subsidies is a particular sore point. A Koch official said that Trump filled out a network policy form saying he opposed ethanol subsidies but has since told audiences in Iowa – where the mandate for ethanol levels is politically sacred – that he thought the Environmental Protection Agency should work to increase the amount of ethanol blended into the nation's gasoline supply. Trump's campaign did not respond to a request for comment.

And given the Koch group's libertarian philosophy, many donors are appalled by what they see as Trump's vision of himself as a king-like figure who believes that he alone can rescue America.

Summing up the general mood was Republican Nebraska Sen. Ben Sasse, who was applauded when he said in a dinner speech, "The way to make America great again is not by abandoning the Constitutional limits and saying to some guy, 'Would you be our king?'"

"We can't give Trump a pass when we don't know what he stands for."

Yet the dangers of attacking Trump are keenly understood and a number of sources within the Koch network stressed that if an attack against Trump can be avoided, it will be.

This is not the first time the Kochs and Trump have been at odds.

The Kochs declined to invite Trump as one of the presidential candidates to attend a donor gathering last summer - the attendees were Rubio, Bush, Cruz, and Fiorina.

In respnose, Trump unloaded on Twitter. "I wish good luck to all of the Republican candidates that traveled to California to beg for money etc. from the Koch Brothers. Puppets?" the billionaire wrote.

Donors and officials worry that a large-scale assault against Trump could encourage him to run as a third party candidate, which could result in Hillary Clinton winning the White House in a similar way that her husband did in 1992 when another populist billionaire, Ross Perot, ran third party and peeled a large number of voters away from the Republican president George H.W. Bush.

There is also a concern that spending a large amount of money against Trump could help the billionaire sell his narrative of being a populist lined up against the establishment and special interests.

Conversations over the weekend suggested that there are a small number Koch figures who remain hopeful that even if Trump does become the nominee, he can be persuaded to adopt more free market policies.

Luke Hilgemann, the CEO of Americans For Prosperity, the spearhead grassroots organization in the Koch network, told The Hill, "If Donald Trump becomes the nominee he's going to need a lot of help with establishing what his platform is and I think we have that platform."

"You're going to see the nominee and the party come on board with the fact that our network is the one that's setting the agenda for the American people, because we have actually talked to them and asked them what their priorities are."

Koch donor Doug Deason told The Hill that while he doesn't support Trump he thinks the billionaire could ultimately stand up for "free enterprise."

"I like him OK," said Deason, a Texas businessman who supported his state's former Gov. Rick Perry's failed presidential bid but says he is now on the verge of donating to Cruz.

"He's a successful man."

http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/267766-koch-brothers-network-ready-to-oppose-trump

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Ethanol Mandate, a Boon to Iowa Alone, Faces Rising Resistance

By Coral Davenport / New York Times / January 31, 2015

AMES, Iowa — Tim Recker has been growing corn in this state his whole life, and using his crops to make ethanol almost as long, at first by the jar for his trucks, now by the barrel for the nation. That is in large part because Congress in 2005 mandated that oil refiners blend ethanol into gasoline.

"When I look out my window and see farms that have built and expanded and improved, it's because of the ethanol mandate," Mr. Recker said from his farm in Arlington, Iowa. Mr. Recker, a Republican, said his decision at the presidential caucuses on Monday would be driven by what candidates have said about the 2005 law, which created the Renewable Fuel Standard.

But beyond the borders of a state with outsize importance in the selection of presidents, ethanol may be losing its grip on the body politic. Energy policy experts, advocates in the fight on poverty and even other farmers say a law that has been a boon for Iowa has been a boondoggle to the rest of the country. The ethanol mandate has driven up food costs while failing to deliver its promised environmental benefits. Rising domestic oil production and a global energy glut have all but nullified the pitch that ethanol would help wean the country off foreign oil.

And now a powerful coalition including oil companies, environmentalists, grocery manufacturers, livestock farmers and humanitarian advocates is pushing Congress to weaken or repeal the mandate. As soon as this week, the Senate could vote on a measure to roll back the Renewable Fuel Standard, just days after the Iowa caucuses close and the issue largely goes to rest for another four years.

Even here, as Iowa urbanizes and diversifies, ethanol may be losing its once-powerful hold, some political consultants say. Senator Ted Cruz of Texas, one of the Republican front-runners in Iowa, has called for an end to subsidies for all forms of energy, as well as a five-year phasing out of the renewable fuel mandate that created the ethanol economy here.

That position drew an unusual repudiation from Iowa's governor, Terry E. Branstad, a Republican who has not endorsed any candidate. "It would be a big mistake for Iowa to support him," Mr. Branstad told reporters at a forum held by the Iowa Renewable Fuels Association.

At the same forum, the other front-runner, Donald J. Trump, said he was "100 percent" behind the ethanol mandate and would even support increasing it further.

"Culturally, anything that supports corn is seen as good," said Bruce Babcock, an economist at Iowa State University, pondering whether ethanol's grip here was slipping. "But if Ted Cruz wins the caucus, there's your answer."

Beyond presidential politics, the weight of opinion is swinging against ethanol, sometimes virulently.

"No genuine Republican would be in favor of increasing an artificial, demand-creating, crony-capitalism measure like the Renewable Fuel Standard," said Thomas Elam, the president of FarmEcon, an independent economic consulting firm in Carmel, Ind. "It's a socialistic, left-wing liberal position. That is so far against fundamental Republican principles of market economics, it shows that Donald Trump will say whatever it takes to get votes in Iowa."

When the Renewable Fuel Standard was enacted, lawmakers hoped to ease the nation's dependence on foreign oil while promoting a low-carbon, climate-friendly alternative. It was viewed as such a success that Congress increased the mandate in 2007: The nation's gasoline refiners must buy and blend an increasing amount of ethanol every year, rising to 36 billion gallons by 2022 from 15 billion now. Only the first 15 billion gallons are supposed to come from corn. The rest of the ethanol is mandated to come from nonfood crops like switch grass, to prevent ethanol from driving up food costs.

But doubts are growing. A number of scientific studies have shown that the environmental benefits of corn ethanol are limited, reducing carbon dioxide only slightly compared with conventional gasoline, partly because a large amount of fuel goes into

growing corn, including in fertilizers and farm equipment.

Since the law's passage, breakthroughs in hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, have led to a boom in domestic oil production. The United States is now exporting oil. But no similar breakthrough in ethanol technology has advanced the industry. Last year, corn ethanol producers easily met the 15-billion-gallon production requirement, but refiners have not been able to make cleaner, noncorn biofuel on a cheap, commercial scale.

"You've got a standard that is not able to be met," said Senator Lisa Murkowski, Republican of Alaska, the chairwoman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. "So you either reform it or get rid of it."

In Iowa, the mandate has attracted major employers like Dow and DuPont, which produce ethanol. Nearly all of the state's approximately 40 ethanol refiners use locally grown corn to produce about four billion gallons annually. Since the law's passage, the price of corn has more than doubled, to an average of $4.11 per bushel in 2014 from an average of $1.96 per bushel in 2005. Between 2011 and 2013, it climbed to $6 per bushel.

"If you live in Iowa in a nice house, and send your kids to good schools, it's because of ethanol," said Eric Hakmiller, the president of Lincolnway Energy, an ethanol plant in Nevada, Iowa.

But high corn prices have raised the cost of livestock feed, and in turn have made meat and dairy more expensive for consumers.

"It's a tax on people who eat food," said Todd Simmons, the chairman of the National Chicken Council and the chief executive of Simmons Foods, a poultry producer in Siloam Springs, Ark.

A 2013 report by FarmEcon, Mr. Elam's consulting firm, said that in the eight years since the passage of the Renewable Fuel Standard, the average annual cost of groceries for a family of four had grown by about $2,000.

"Mandates for food-based biofuels like corn ethanol increase hunger," said Kelly Stone, a policy analyst with ActionAid USA, a nonprofit advocacy group working to end poverty.

An already subsidized farm economy has found another subsidy. The Environmental Working Group, a Washington advocacy organization, says Iowa corn farmers received $15 billion in federal farm subsidies between 1995 and 2012.

"The ethanol mandate is obsolete," said Scott Faber, the group's vice president of government affairs. "It's the toothpick on the subsidy club sandwich."

Iowa has become less dependent on ethanol, and voters who are not directly dependent on ethanol appear to be less concerned about the fate of the mandate.

"It's created a lot of jobs," Michael Johnston, a truck driver and an independent, said over a beer at Dottie's Landmark Bar and Grill in Polk City, discussing his caucus vote. "I like it the way it is. But ethanol wouldn't be the deciding factor. It's only one part of the economy. I care about taxes, national security."

At a Pizza Ranch outside Ames, Kathleen Johns, a retired factory worker and a Republican, said Social Security was her biggest concern, not ethanol. "I know about it, but I'm not worried about it too much," she said.

http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/01/us/politics/ethanol-mandate-a-boon-to-iowa-alone-faces-rising-resistance.html

GMO fuel waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone, NOx and CO2 transportation pollution

I want $2 Gasoline at the pump / We want clean air and water

Let's improve performance of climate change law in 2016 for future generations

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Cruz blasts Branstad on ethanol mandate

By Rebecca Savransky / THE HILL / January 31, 2016

Republican presidential candidate Ted Cruz on Sunday blasted Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad (R), saying his son is a lobbyist "who makes hundreds of thousands of dollars lobbying on ethanol."

Cruz backs a plan to phase out the federal ethanol mandate, which requires fuel refiners to blend a certain amount of ethanol into their gasoline supply. That stance caused the Iowa governor to urge voters to reject Cruz.

But Cruz said on NBC's "Meet the Press" Sunday morning that the people who are attacking him are lobbyists and Democrats. He also noted the governor's family makes "a ton of money" lobbying on ethanol.

"And the lobbyists very much want to keep Iowa focused on the ethanol mandate, because it keeps Iowa dependent on Washington," he said. "It means every year, they've got to go back to Washington and maintain the mandate. The lobbyists get paid, the politicians get paid."

Cruz said he's going to "eliminate all the subsidies." But he added that he also is going to "tear down the EPA's ethanol blend wall, which means make it legal to sell mid-level blends of ethanol."

"And that, in turn, can expand ethanol's share of the marketplace by 60 percent, but not based on mandates or subsidies, based on the free market," he said.

Cruz said his plan would actually expand Iowa's economy instead of hurt it.

"No other candidate is focusing on the future for ethanol," he said. "And you know who's hurt by my plan? The lobbyists in Washington. And the people who are helped are Iowa farmers and jobs here in the state of Iowa."

http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/267661-cruz-blasts-branstad-on-ethanol-mandate#disqus_thread

California AB 32 Pavley GMO fuel waiver can increase the Honorable Governor Jerry Brown climate law performance with improved ground ozone, NOx and CO2 in 2016

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Cruz victory in Iowa threatens ethanol's power

By Alex Guillén & Jenny Hopkinson, Politico, January 28, 2016

For election after election, contenders for the White House knew one thing they had to do to win Iowa's first-in-the-nation presidential caucus: pay homage to the state's corn ethanol industry.

But a potential victory next week by Ted Cruz is threatening to explode that script.

Already, the Republican Texas senator has defied the caucus' usual political gravity by flying high in the polls in Iowa, despite his years of efforts to kill a federal ethanol mandate that supports tens of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of investments in the state. Recent surveys show him either neck-and-neck with or just behind Donald Trump, who backs the mandate.

A Cruz victory in Monday's GOP caucus would deal a death blow to ethanol's already waning clout on Capitol Hill, say critics of the biofuel program, many of whom are allied with the oil industry.

"The impenetrable wall that is the corn lobby could come a-tumbling down if Ted Cruz ends up pulling it off," said Tom Pyle, president of the American Energy Alliance, a conservative group — aligned with oil industry billionaires Charles and David Koch — that wants a full repeal of the ethanol program.

"Once it becomes obvious a Republican politician can be against ethanol and it doesn't really cost much, everyone's going to be against the mandate," said Mike McKenna, a Republican energy lobbyist whose clients include Koch Industries' government and public affairs branch.

Iowa's ethanol supporters, including Republican Gov. Terry Branstad and his allies, are frantically working to keep that from happening.

A Cruz victory is "absolutely" a threat, said Derek Eadon, a Des Moines political consultant and senior adviser to America's Renewable Future, a pro-ethanol group led by one of Branstad's sons. The group is dogging Cruz's appearances around the state and airing ads denouncing him as a "hypocrite," saying he opposes ethanol incentives yet supports "the nearly $5 billion in subsidies received by the oil industry."

Republican ex-Sen. Rick Santorum, who is polling at just 1 to 2 percent in the state, similarly warned that a Cruz win would spell the beginning of the end of the ethanol mandate, also known as the Renewable Fuel Standard. "You will kill the RFS, and Iowa will have its fingerprints on the weapon," he said during a biofuels summit last week.

Cruz's campaign did not respond to requests for comment.

This is far different from ethanol's stature during the 2008 caucus, which took place weeks after Congress created the mandate's current version in hopes of stemming the oil imports that had spiked during the Iraq War. The mandate requires gasoline refiners to blend billions of gallons of ethanol into their fuel each year, and has helped spur a biofuel boom that now turns more than 40 percent of the nation's corn crop into ethanol.

Then-Sens. Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden all supported the bill at the time. Ethanol also had the backing of former President George W. Bush, along with the last two Republicans to win in Iowa, Mike Huckabee and Santorum.

But the roster of the mandate's critics has grown, including chicken farmers and food manufacturers who blame it for spiking corn prices and environmental groups that say it has led to water pollution. Support for the program has also suffered because of the U.S. energy boom of the past decade, along with sharp declines in oil imports and lagging gasoline consumption.

Seeking to dent Cruz's chances, ARF has deployed its staff to follow the senator around the state and question him about his stance on the fuel, and is pouring as much as $5 million into its get-out-the-vote efforts and an ad campaign. But ethanol backers are also spinning a Cruz victory as not necessarily devastating to their cause, saying they have the support of almost every other presidential candidate on the ballot.

"The vast, overwhelming majority of Iowa voters are going to go to the caucus and vote for a pro-RFS candidate," said Monte Shaw, executive director of the Iowa Renewable Fuels Association. Shaw also held out the possibility that Cruz's stance on ethanol could cost him the state in November if he makes it to the general election.

Still, even the creation of ARF can be seen as a sign that ethanol's political power in Iowa has been on the downswing. Ethanol interests formed the group last year, aiming to pressure candidates during the primaries, after Republican Joni Ernst won Iowa's 2014 Senate race despite saying she "philosophically" opposes the fuel mandate.

This time, the group says it has secured promises from 50,000 caucus-goers who say they will support a pro-ethanol candidate — which, by the group's estimation, includes anyone except Cruz or Kentucky Republican Sen. Rand Paul. About half those voters are Republican, the group said, meaning they have secured a healthy percentage of voters in the GOP caucus (122,000 Republicans voted in the 2012 caucus). ARF employs 23 paid workers, including 17 field staff working out turnout, and has blanketed Iowa with television, radio and online ads.

Branstad added to the anti-Cruz campaign last week, when he broke his decades of neutrality in the caucuses by calling for the senator's defeat.

"He is the biggest opponent of renewable fuels," Branstad said, adding that Cruz "could be very damaging to our state."

Ethanol supporters in the state say the mandate's fate is weighing heavily on some Iowa voters.

"It would be devastating to corn farmers if you got rid of the RFS and got rid of the growth that we need in biofuels," said Kevin Ross, a corn farmer near Underwood, Iowa, and member of the Corn Board for the National Corn Growers Association. He added, "I hear from a lot of folks that there are a lot of undecided voters out there and most of those people are not pleased with Ted Cruz."

Trump could benefit from this unhappiness, said Bill Couser, who raises corn and cattle near Nevada, Iowa, and sits on the board of a local ethanol plant. "I know there is a lot of people who are going to vote for Trump because they don't want Cruz to win," he said.

Trump praised the ethanol mandate during an Iowa renewable fuels summit last week, calling it "an important tool in the mission to achieve energy independence."

Cruz's stance on the program has shifted somewhat over the years, though not nearly enough to satisfy the pro-ethanol camp: While he once sponsored legislation that would have immediately repealed the mandate, he has more recently supported phasing it out over five years. That phase-out wouldn't end until 2022, Cruz now tells Iowans.

Cruz even made a point of taking his anti-mandate message to an agricultural summit last year in Des Moines. "Look, I recognize that this is a gathering of a lot of folks who the answer that you'd like me to give is, 'I'm for the RFS, darn it.' That would be the easy thing to do," Cruz said at the time. "But I'll tell you, people are pretty fed up, I think, with politicians that run around and tell one group one thing, tell another group another thing."

One Iowa ethanol industry official called himself a conservative who agrees with Cruz on many issues, but said the Texas senator's policy and rhetorical shifts on ethanol issues have provided a "window" into Cruz's true politics.

"It's raised more fundamental questions with me on whether or not I can trust him," said the source, who is uncertain for which other candidate he will caucus.

Cruz still has some prominent defenders in Iowa, including GOP Rep. Steve King, who endorsed the senator in November. King, whose district produces more ethanol than any other in the country, drew a lot of criticism for the endorsement, but he argues that Cruz's stance on the mandate is perhaps the best way to more the industry forward.

King noted that Cruz — a major recipient of oil and gas industry cash — is pushing for a flat tax that would also eliminate all government subsidies for energy, including those for the oil industry. That would level the playing field between the two fuels, King said, while a phase-out could provide a soft landing for ethanol, which is already under attack from lawmakers.

"We have a huge opposition to the RFS in Congress and they are going to continue to press that," King said. "The ability to continue the RFS through statute in Congress, it's not there."

While ethanol supporters may be leery of Cruz, at least he has a plan for dealing with the mandate, King said. He said the industry is better off with a candidate who understands the issue — and "Ted Cruz does."

http://www.politico.com/story/2016/01/ted-cruz-iowa-ethanol-218328

California AB 32 Pavley GMO fuel waiver can increase the Honorable Governor Jerry Brown climate law performance with improved ground ozone, NOx and CO2 in 2016

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

TRUMP LOVES
GMO CORN MANDATE
510-537-1796

The Washington Post

public record
W. Orcicy

Business

What it's like to house-hunt in Silicon Valley, the nation's priciest market

By Todd C. Frankel December 31, 2015

LOS GATOS, CALIF. — It's Sunday, which means house-hunting for Barry and Katie Templin. They have been on the prowl for months and saving for years, looking for a place with reasonable commutes to their technology jobs and good public schools for their two young children. They hope that is not too much to ask, even in Silicon Valley, the nation's most expensive housing market.

They pull their decade-old SUV up to a house that needs to be torn down yet is offered at $1.5 million. "Home has original GE metal kitchen cabinets," the listing brags. They walk up to find the house unlocked and empty. Black mold crawls over the walls. The ceiling is caving in. The wood floors groan as they pass through.

"It's like going into a haunted house," Barry Templin says.

"I can't believe this is 1.5," Katie Templin says.

"It's because it's Los Gatos," explains agent Laura DeFilippo of Alain Pinel Realtors.

The median home value in the San Jose region — which includes the headquarters of Facebook, Apple and Google — has reached $922,100, five times that of the nation overall and 2.5 times the Washington area's $356,000 median, according to real estate website Zillow.com.

That's also 20 percent higher than nearby San Francisco, the nation's No. 2 market and the usual target of eye-rolling about a tech-fueled, out-of-control housing market.

But the market is even crazier in the sedate suburbs to the south, in places such as Los Gatos.

The situation in Silicon Valley has long been a full-blown affordability crisis for teachers and construction workers, anyone who draws a paycheck without stock options. Even doctors and lawyers find themselves priced out of popular areas, according to real estate agents. Now, it is becoming harder for tech workers who are willing to spend well over $1 million for what was once a standard-issue suburban home.

As prices spiral ever higher, there is growing concern about Silicon Valley's ability to attract and keep its tech talent, especially as the millennial workers who flocked here during the current boom grow up, shed roommates, start families and look for homes of their own.

"It's an increasingly challenging phenomenon," said Carl Guardino, president of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, which has found that the region's company executives cite housing as their biggest impediment to recruitment.

For people moving to Silicon Valley, home prices often lead to disillusionment, said Eric Boyenga, a real estate agent specializing in the area. Many still feel compelled to move. But not everyone gives in.

Boyenga recalled spending weeks showing homes to a client from North Carolina who had just sold his company to eBay, based in San Jose, and planned to move to Silicon Valley. His budget was $6 million. But he decided after weeks of looking that it was cheaper to stay on the East Coast and fly out a couple of times each month.

"What you get for $4 million to $5 million here is what you can get for $350,000 in North Carolina," Boyenga said.

Barry and Katie Templin moved to Silicon Valley right out of college, more than a decade ago. They rented, then bought a small condo in San Jose, then went back to renting. They got married. They had a son. Wyatt is now 3. Their daughter, Hazel, arrived four months ago. Now, the Templins want a place to put down roots.

They both grew up in the Midwest — he's from Indiana, she's from Wisconsin — and their parents back home delight in hearing about the house hunt. To them, it sounds like a tragicomedy. The Templins are up against buyers paying all in cash and willing to waive contingencies. And $1 million is the absolute bottom floor. (Anything lower leads to an open-house stampede and a bidding war.)

"My parents are just horrified by the housing prices," Barry Templin, 37, said, laughing.

Katie Templin, 36, said her father enjoys pointing out that she could buy an entire office building in her hometown of La Crosse, Wis. To make his point, he sent her a listing for a brick, three-story, former bank branch.

"He thinks it's just absurd," Katie Templin said.

"But out here, it doesn't shock people," Barry Templin said.

They love Silicon Valley. The sun is always shining. The winters are mild. Beaches and mountains are a one-hour drive away. They both work at start-ups. He is vice president of engineering at CardioKinetix, a medical device company working on an implant for heart failure. She is a program manager at AcelRx Pharmaceuticals.

"You can't beat the opportunities available at tech companies," she said.

Before crossing the haunted house off their list, the couple visited a property billed as a "Lovely Silicon Valley Farmhouse." It was farmhouse red, but there was no farm. It sat off a quiet residential street. The kitchen was dated. The den had peculiar wood paneling on the floor and ceiling. But it had three beds and 1,500 square feet of living space for $1.25 million.

In Silicon Valley, that's a deal.

They put it on their list of maybes.

DeFilippo, their agent, used to work as a lawyer. But two years ago — when she moved from Atlanta to Silicon Valley, in part to be closer to her sister, an Apple executive — she became fascinated by the local real estate market. So she switched careers. Now, she is making more than she ever did as a lawyer.

But that still hasn't allowed her to afford her own home. As she took the Templins to tour another home, DeFilippo drove by the tiny two-bedroom house she rents for $3,600 a month.

"I'd like to buy, but it's not in the foreseeable future," she said.

The Templins' infant daughter was getting fussy. The day's last house would be a California Mission-style home for $1.4 million. But the front door was locked. The lockbox was empty. The listing agent didn't answer DeFilippo's calls. The seller holds all the power in a hot market like this one. Katie Templin peered into the windows. She wasn't thrilled by the location.

They decided to keep hunting. DeFilippo was certain that the Templins would eventually find a home to buy.

"They'll get in here," she said. "I know they will."

Weeks later, after several more house-hunting sorties and failing to win a fierce bidding war for a $1.3 million fixer-upper, they did. It was another $1.3 million home. It was in good shape, with four bedrooms and two bathrooms, and offered 1,600 square feet. But it was located in south San Jose, just outside their ideal location.

The house is a mid-century modern tract home, what is known as an Eichler, named after noted developer Joseph Eichler, who built 11,000 clean-lined, simple homes in California after World War II. Steve Jobs credited growing up in an Eichler house in Mountain View with influencing his design aesthetic at Apple, although there is some controversy about whether the childhood home of Silicon Valley's patron saint really was one.

In any case, the Templins now have an Eichler of their own. They move in January. They will happily leave the house hunt to someone else.

Todd C. Frankel is a reporter covering people and policy. You can follow him on Twitter: @tcfrankel.

Public Record W. Grich

Dispossessed in the Land of Dreams

Sometime in July 2012, Suzan Russaw and her husband, James, received a letter from their landlord asking them to vacate their $800-a-month one-bedroom apartment in Palo Alto, California. He gave them 60 days to leave. The "no-fault" eviction is a common way to clear out low-paying tenants without a legal hassle and bring in people willing to pay thousands more in rent. James was 83 at the time and suffering from the constellation of illnesses that affect the old: He had high blood pressure and was undergoing dialysis for kidney failure and experiencing the early stages of dementia.

Their rent was actually a couple of hundred dollars more than James's monthly Social Security benefits, but he made up the rest by piecing together odd jobs. They looked for a new apartment for two months and didn't find anything close to their price range. Their landlord gave them a six-week extension, but it yielded nothing. When mid-October came, Suzan and James had no choice but to leave. With hurried help from neighbors, they packed most of their belongings into two storage units and a ramshackle 1994 Ford Explorer which they called "the van." They didn't know where they were going.

A majority of the homeless population in Palo Alto—93 percent—ends up sleeping outside or in their cars. In part, that's because Palo Alto, a technology boomtown that boasts a per capita income well over twice the average for California, has almost no shelter space: For the city's homeless population, estimated to be at least 157, there are just 15 beds that rotate among city churches through a shelter program called Hotel de Zink; a charity organizes a loose network of 130 spare rooms, regular people motivated to offer up their homes only by neighborly goodwill. The lack of shelter space in Palo Alto—and more broadly in Santa Clara and San Mateo counties, which comprise the peninsula south of San Francisco and around San Jose—is unusual for an area of its size and population. A 2013 census showed Santa Clara County having more than 7,000 homeless people, the fifth-highest homeless population per capita in the country and among the highest populations sleeping outside or in unsuitable shelters like vehicles.

San Francisco and the rest of the Bay Area are gentrifying rapidly—especially with the most recent Silicon Valley surge in social media companies, though the trend stretches back decades—leading to a cascade of displacement of the region's poor, working class, and ethnic and racial minorities. In San Francisco itself, currently the city with the most expensive housing market in the country, rents increased 13.5 percent in 2014 from the year before, leading more people to the middle-class suburbs. As real estate prices rise in places like Palo Alto, the middle class has begun to buy homes in the exurbs of the Central Valley, displacing farmworkers there.

Suzan, who is 70, is short and slight, with her bobbed hair dyed red. The first time I met her, she wore leggings, a T-shirt, a black cardigan wrapped around her shoulders, and fuzzy black boots I later learned

were slippers she'd gotten from Goodwill and sewn up to look like outside shoes. (She wore basically the same outfit, with different T-shirts, nearly every time we met, and I realized she didn't have many clothes.) Her voice is high and singsongy and she is always polite. You can tell she tries to smooth out tensions rather than confront them. She is a font of forced sunniness and likes to punctuate a sad sentence with phrases like "I'm so blessed!" or "I'm so lucky!" She wore a small necklace and said jewelry was important to her. "I feel, to dispel the image of homelessness, it's important to have a little bling," she said.

In the van, Suzan was in charge of taking care of everyone and everything, organizing a life that became filled with a unique brand of busy boredom. She and James spent most of their time figuring out where to go next, how to get there, and whether they could stay once they arrived. They found a short-term unit in a local family shelter in Menlo Park that lasted for five weeks. Afterward, they stayed in a few motels, but even fleabags in the area charge upwards of $100 a night. When they couldn't afford a room they camped out in the van, reclining the backseats and making a pallet out of blankets piled on top of their clothes and other belongings. Slowly, there were fewer nights in hotels and more in the van, until the van was where they lived.

A life of homelessness is one of logistical challenges and exhaustion. Little things, like planning a wardrobe for the week, involved coordinated trips to storage units and laundromats, and could take hours. The biggest conundrum? Where to pull over and sleep. Suzan and James learned quickly not to pull over on a residential block, because the neighbors would call the police. They tried a church or two, 24-hour businesses where they thought they could hide amidst the other cars, and even an old naval field. The places with public toilets were best because, for reasons no one can quite explain, 3 a.m. is the witching hour for needing to pee. They kept their socks and shoes on, both for staying warm on chilly Bay Area nights and also for moving quickly if someone peered into their windows, or a cop flashed his light inside, ready to rouse. Wherever they were sleeping, they couldn't sleep there. "Sometimes, I was so tired, I would be stopped at a red light and say, 'Don't go to sleep. Don't go to sleep,'" Suzan said. "And then I would fall asleep."

A few months in, a nice man in a 7-Eleven parking lot told them about a former high school turned community center on the eastern side of town called Cubberley. He'd walked up to their van after recognizing signs of life in the car, tired faces among the junk piling up in the back. Suzan and James were familiar with the community center because they'd taken their daughter to preschool there many years before, but they hadn't thought about sleeping there. Cubberley had a quiet back parking lot, a flat grass amphitheater with a concrete paddock for a stage, and 24-hour public bathrooms with showers in an old gym. Rumor was that the cops wouldn't bother anyone.

Suzan's husband, James Russaw, pictured with two of their grandchildren.

Cubberley was a psychic relief because it solved so many basic needs: It had a place to bathe in the morning, a place to charge your phone. The parking lot had also formed its own etiquette and sense of community. People tended to park in the same places, a spot or two next to their neighbors, and they recognized one another and nodded at night. They weren't exactly friends, but they were people who trusted each other, an impromptu neighborhood no one wanted to lose after losing so much. It was safe, a good place to spend the night. But it was next door to a segment of homeowners who were fighting hard to move the car dwellers out.

Normally, wealthy people who move into an area don't see the results of their displacement because the people who lose their homes don't stick around; they move to cheaper suburbs and work themselves into the fabric elsewhere. But the folks at Cubberley, 30 people on any given night, were the displacement made manifest. Most weren't plagued with mental health or substance abuse problems; they simply could no longer afford rent and became homeless in the last place they lived. People will put up with a lot to stay in a place they know. "I've been analyzing why don't I just get the heck on. Everybody says that, go to Wyoming, Montana, you can get a mansion," Suzan said. "Move on, move on, always move on. And I say to myself, 'Why should I have to move on?'"

It's a new chapter in an old story. In his seminal 1893 lecture at the Chicago World's Fair, Frederick Jackson Turner summarized the myth of the American frontier and the waves of settlers who created it as

an early form of gentrification: First, farmers looking for land would find a remote spot of wilderness to tame; once they succeeded, more men and women would arrive to turn each new spot into a town; finally, outside investors would swoop in, pushing out the frontiersman and leaving him to pack up and start all over again. It has always been thus in America. Turner quoted from a guide published in 1837 for migrants headed for the Western frontiers of Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin: "Another wave rolls on. The men of capital and enterprise come. The 'settler' is ready to sell out and take the advantage of the rise of property, push farther into the interior, and become himself a man of capital and enterprise in turn." This repeating cycle, Turner argued, of movement and resettlement was essential to the American character. But he foresaw a looming crisis. "The American energy will continually demand a wider field for its exercise," he wrote. "But never again will such gifts of free land offer themselves." In other words, we would run out of places for the displaced to go.

Suzan was born in 1945. Her father worked at what was then the Lockheed Corporation, and her mother had been raised by a wealthy family in Oak Park, Illinois. Her family called her Suzi. Though she grew up in nearby Saratoga—and spent some time in school in Switzerland—she distinctly remembers coming with her mother to visit Palo Alto, with its downtown theaters and streets named after poets. Palo Alto more than any other place formed the landscape of her childhood. "It was a little artsy-craftsy university town—you find charming towns are university towns."

Like many women of her day, Suzan didn't graduate from college. When she was 24, after her last stay in Switzerland, she moved to Mountain View, the town on Palo Alto's eastern border that is now home to Google and LinkedIn. She was living off a small trust her family had set up for her when she met James at a barbecue their apartment manager threw to foster neighborliness among his tenants. James had grown up in a sharecropping family in Georgia, moved west during World War II, and was more than 17 years her senior, handsome and gentlemanly. Suzan thought: "I can learn something from him." They were an interracial couple in the late 1960s, which was unusual, though she says her family didn't mind. It was also an interclass marriage, and it moved Suzan down the income ladder.

For years, James and Suzan lived together, unmarried. They bought a house on University Avenue, just north of the county line and blocks from downtown Palo Alto, in 1979, and four years later had their only daughter, Nancy. It was the area's ghetto, and the only source of affordable housing for many years. It was also the center of violence in the region, and, in 1992, was the murder capital of the country.

They never had much money. For most of their marriage, James ran a small recycling company and Suzan acted as his bookkeeper, secretary, and housewife. They refused to apply for most government assistance, even as homeless elders. "My husband and I had never been on welfare or food stamps," she told me. "Even to this day."

Suzan's parents died in 2002 and 2003, and her older sister died in 2009. ("I thank God that they're gone," she told me. "They would die if they saw me now.") It was a hard time for Suzan, who went to care for her dying parents and nearly left James. She felt he'd checked out of the difficulties. In retrospect,

she thinks his dementia might already have been setting in; James was already in his seventies. He had taken out a second mortgage on their home, and they couldn't pay it after he retired. They sold the house at a loss in 2005; it's now a Century 21 office.

After they moved into the van, they settled into a routine. On the nights before James's early-morning treatments, they slept in the dialysis center's parking lot. Otherwise they generally stayed at Cubberley. They were still living off James's retirement income, but most of it went to the $500 needed to rent the two storage units where their furniture remained, until they lost one for nonpayment. Finally, a few months in, Suzan was able to use a clause in a trust set up by her mother's father to help her out in an emergency. It doubled their income—much of which was eaten up by the costs of gas, the remaining storage unit, parking tickets, and the other expenses of an unsettled life. It was a respectable income, one that technically kept them above poverty, but it still wasn't enough for rent.

James was increasingly ill and van life was taking a toll. In addition to James's other problems, both he and Suzan were starting to experience some of the health problems common among the homeless. The backseat of the van filled with bags of clothes, papers, fast-food detritus, pens, old parking tickets, and receipts. As the junk built up, the recline of their seats inched forever upward, until they were sitting up all the time, causing their legs to swell and nerves to become damaged, the medical consequences of not being able to raise your feet at night.

Gentrification used to be about poor neighborhoods, usually black and brown, underdeveloped and full of decrepit and neglected housing stock, run by the occasional slumlord—often described as "blighted," though that designation has always been problematic—and how they become converted into wealthier ones, usually through the influx of richer white people and their demand for new services and new construction. It's a negative process for the people who have to move, but there's occasionally an element of good, because neglected neighborhoods revive. But what's happening now in the Bay Area is that people who've done nothing wrong—not paid their rent late, violated their lease, or committed any other housing sin—are being forced out to make way. Displacement is reaching into unquestionably vibrant, historic, middle- and working-class neighborhoods, like The Mission in San Francisco, a former center of Chicano power. (The Mission alone has lost 8,000 Latino residents in the past ten years, according to a report from the local Council of Community Housing Organizations and the Mission Economic Development Agency.) And it's happening to such an extent that the social workers who used to steer people to affordable apartments as far away as Santa Rosa or Sacramento, a two-hour drive, are now telling people to look even farther out. The vehicle dwellers I spoke with said they'd heard of friends living in places like Stockton, once a modest working-class city in the middle of the state, receiving notice-to-vacate letters like the one Suzan and James received.

For the most part, the traits that draw people to Palo Alto—good schools, a charming downtown, nice neighborhoods in which to raise a family, and a short commute to tech jobs—are the very same things that made the residents of Cubberley want to stay, even if it meant living in their car. The destabilizing pressure of a real estate market is also felt by the merely rich, the upper middle class, and the middle

class, because the high-end demand of the global elite sets the market prices. "My block has the original owners, a retired schoolteacher and a retired postal worker," said Hope Nakamura, a legal aid attorney who lives in Palo Alto. "They could never afford to buy anything there now." Most people told me if they had to sell their homes today they wouldn't be able to buy again anywhere in the area, which means many Palo Altans have all of their wealth tied up in expensive homes that they can't access without upending their lives. It makes everyone anxious.

The view inside a van parked outside a Palo Alto homeless organization.

The outcry from the neighbors over Cubberley was so fierce that it reshaped Palo Alto's city government. The city council is nonpartisan, but a faction emerged that revived an old, slow-growth movement in town, known as the "residentialists." Their concerns are varied (among them, the perennial suburban concerns of property values and traffic), but their influence has been to block any new development of affordable housing and shoo people like Suzan and James away from Palo Alto. An uproar scuttled an affordable-housing building for senior citizens near many public transit options that had been proposed by the city housing authority and unanimously approved by the city council. Opponents said they were worried about the effect the development would have on the surrounding community—they argued it wasn't zoned for "density," which is to say, small apartments—and that traffic congestion in the area would be made worse. Aparna Ananthasubramaniam, then a senior at Stanford, tried to start a women's-only shelter in rotating churches, modeled after the Hotel de Zink. She said a woman came up to her after a community meeting where the same concerns had been raised by a real estate agent. "Her lips were

quivering and she was physically shaking from how angry she was," Ananthasubramaniam told me. "She was like, 'You come back to me 20 years from now once you have sunk more than $1 million into an asset, like a house, and you tell me that you're willing to take a risk like this."

The trouble for Cubberley began when neighbors went to the police. There'd been at least one fight, and the neighbors complained about trash left around the center. At the time, Cubberley was home to a 64-year-old woman who'd found a $20-an-hour job after nine years of unemployment; a tall, lanky, panhandler from Louisiana who kept informal guard over her and other women at the center; a 63-year-old part-time school crossing guard who cared for his dying mother for 16 years, then lived off the proceeds from the sale of her house until the money ran out; two retired school teachers; a 23-year-old Palo Alto native who stayed with his mother in a rental car after his old car spontaneously combusted; and, for about six months, Suzan and James. "They didn't fit this image that the powers that be are trying to create about homeless people. They did not fit that image at all," Suzan told me. "We made sure the premises were respected, because it was an honor to be able to stay there." She and others told me they cleaned up their areas at the center every morning.

Pressured to find a way to move the residents out, the police department went to the city council claiming they needed a law banning vehicle habitation to address the neighbors' concerns. Advocates for the homeless said that any problems could be solved if police would just enforce existing laws. Local attorneys warned the city council that such laws could soon be considered unconstitutional, because the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was hearing a challenge to a similar law in Los Angeles. Carrie LeRoy, an attorney who advocated on behalf of the unhoused, and other attorneys threatened to file a class-action lawsuit if the vehicle-habitation ban ever went into effect. The city council passed the ban anyway, in a 7-2 vote in August 2013, and the police department and other groups in the city started an outreach program to tell people about the law. "All of them had received these notices from the city," LeRoy said, "And it was basically like, 'Get out of our town.'"

A few weeks later, the city council also voted to close the showers at Cubberley and give it a 10:30 p.m. curfew, which made it illegal to sleep there. On their last night there, in October 2013, Suzan and James left around 8 p.m. so they wouldn't get caught past the new curfew. They tried some old haunts and got kicked out. The stress of living in the van was hard on James. Around this time, James decided to end his dialysis. "Of course, we knew what that meant," Suzan said.

One night, about a month after leaving Cubberley, the police pulled Suzan and James over. Their registration was expired. "This officer, he got a wild hair, and he said, 'I'm going to impound your car,' and called the tow truck." Suzan told me. They got out of the car. Without pushing and demanding, she realized, she was never going to get out of the situation. She told me she said to the officer, "This is our home, and if you impound it we will not have a home." He insisted. "I said 'That's fine. You do that. We will stay right here. I will put the beds out, I will put what we need here, right here on the sidewalk." Other officers arrived and talked to them. They asked Suzan whether, surely, there was some other place they could go. "I said, 'We have no place to go, and we're staying right here.' I was going to make a stink.

They were going to know about it." Suzan told me people were poking their heads out of their homes, and she realized the bigger fuss she made, the more likely officers might decide just to leave them alone.

Because James's health had continued to worsen, he and Suzan finally qualified for motel vouchers during the cold weather. They got a room in a rundown hotel. "It had a microwave and a hot bath," Suzan said. In his last few days, James was given a spot in a hospice in San Jose, and Suzan went with him. "It was so cut-and-dry. They said, 'This is an end-of-life bed, period,'" Suzan said. "And I never said that to James." He died on February 17, 2014, and a few weeks later a friend of theirs held a memorial service for James at her house. Suzan wore an old silk jacket of her mother's, one that would later be ruined by moisture in the van, and a necklace Nancy had made. They ate James's favorite foods—cornbread, shrimp, and pound cake. Suzan had a few motel vouchers left, and afterward stayed with friends and volunteers for a few weeks each, but she felt she was imposing.

That summer, she returned to her van. It was different without James; she realized she'd gotten to know him better during their van life than she ever had before. Maybe it was his dementia, but as they drove around or sat together, squished amidst their stuff, he'd started to tell her long stories, over and over, of his youth in Georgia. She'd never heard the tales before, but she'd started to be able to picture it all. On her own, without his imposing figure beside her, Suzan was scared, and more than a little lonely. Most nights, she stayed tucked away in a church parking lot, without permission from the pastor, hidden between bushes and vans. The law wasn't being enforced, but sleeping in the lot made her a kind of a criminal. "The neighbors never gave me up," she said.

Suzan told me she was in a fog of denial after James's death, but it's probably what protected her because homelessness is exhausting. "You start to lose it after a while," she said. "You feel disenfranchised from your own society." The Downtown Streets Team, a local homeless organization, had been helping her look for a long-term, stable housing solution. Indeed, Suzan told me that at various times, she and James had 27 applications in for affordable housing in Palo Alto. (When he died, she had to start over, submitting new applications for herself.) Her social worker at the local senior citizens center, Emily Farber, decided to also look for a temporary situation that would get Suzan under a roof for a few months, or even a few weeks. "We were dealing with very practical limitations: having a computer, having a stable phone number," Farber said. Craigslist was only something Suzan had heard of. She'd finally gotten a cell phone through a federal program, but hadn't quite mastered it.

For many months, Farber struck out. She didn't think Suzan would want to live with three 25-year-old Google employees, or that they'd want her, either. She even tried Airbnb. Because Suzan didn't have a profile, Farber used her own, and wrote to people who had rooms listed to say her 69-year-old friend needed a place to stay in the area for a couple of weeks. "We got three rejections in a row," she said. Finally, in November, they found a room available for rent for $1,100—about 80 percent of her income from the trust and her widow's benefits from Social Security. Suzan would have her own bedroom and bathroom in the two-bedroom apartment of a single mother. The mother crowded into the other bedroom with her 16-year-old son and seven-year-old daughter. The only downside for Suzan was that it was in

Santa Clara, another charmingly bland suburban enclave in the South Bay, a half hour south of Palo Alto and a world away for Suzan. “It’s out of my comfort zone, but that’s OK!” she told me.

I met Suzan on the day she moved in, and the concept of being able to close a door was almost as unsettling to her as the concept of sleeping in the van had been. “I’m in this kind of survival mode," she said, and had found a certain comfort in her van. “I’ve got this little cocoon I’m staying in, and everything is within arm’s reach.” She had a big blue mat in the back of the van, like a grown-up version of the kind kindergartners nap on, but soon she’d acquire a bed. She retrieved her old TV from her storage unit. She made a comfortable room, with chairs and a bed and a small table, and decided to eat her meals in there. She only signed a lease for three months, because it wasn’t really sustainable on her fixed income. She’d also applied for an affordable housing complex being built for seniors in Sunnyvale, one that would provide permanent housing for 60 senior citizens from among the 7,000 homeless people in the county at the time. She’d find out in April if she was selected in the lottery. All her hopes were pinned on it.