



LAND USE PROPOSAL

THE EVERGREEN * EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A group of residents from District 8 believe the quality of life, management of congestion, improvement of regional transportation, encouraging economic development, and promoting affordable housing can be achieved by adopting our land use proposal. Surrounding districts affected by development have been accounted for in this plan as well as the landowners. We believe that we have struck a balance between sensible development and residential quality while creating a large pool of resources for beneficial improvement, thus creating a win-win partnership for the City. The City has a responsibility to provide transportation and amenity needs to its residents. District 8 is making a very substantial contribution by this proposal generating funds and land resources to create community assets. By engaging in a partnership with the City as well as with residents and landowners, we are demonstrating how the needs of all concerned parties can be addressed while also ensuring that all concerned and involved parties exercise real responsibility. This sharing of risk, reward, and responsibility are essential to purposeful development of our City. Thank you for your attention.

We ask for your full and serious consideration of this proposal. It is a sober yet optimistic program that understands that this land use decision is citywide in its implications. It has much to offer to the entire City, the District, as well as the economic stakeholders. Our plan preserves the jobs-housing balance, spurs healthy economic growth, and manages congestion; all of these elements are vital to maintaining a healthy, sustainable community. Please adopt our plan as the proposal for the Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy.

Brief Summary of Our Proposal for Maximum Housing Units Allowed

	Retain Campus Industrial						
	Arcadia	Berg/IDS	Legacy	Golf Course	College		
Large Lot Conventional	0	450	0	200	0		
Small Lot Conventional	0	150	0	150	0		
Small Lot AL	0	125	0	150	0		
Town Home	700	75	0	100	0		
Multi-Family	700	0	0	0	0		
Affordable/Work	400	0	0	0	250	16.88%	650
						Background Units	
Total units	1800	800	0	600	250	400	3850
Net acres	81	200	120	114	27		542



LAND USE PROPOSAL

PREPARED FOR

THE EVERGREEN * EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY TASK FORCE

In Response to
City of San Jose
Planning Services Division
Invitation to submit land use alternatives, which was issued 14 July, 2006

4 August 2006

Prepared By
Concerned Residents of District 8
San Jose, CA



Table of Contents

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION.....1
- 2.0 BACKGROUND.....1
 - 2.1 CURRENT DEVELOPMENT POLICY2
 - 2.2 TRAFFIC SITUATION2
 - 2.3 PROJECT IMPACT TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE INCLUDING CONGESTION2
 - 2.4 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SITES3
 - 2.4.1 *Arcadia Site*3
 - 2.4.2 *Campus Industrial Site*4
 - 2.4.3 *Evergreen Valley College Site*4
 - 2.4.4 *Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site*5
- 3.0 DEVELOPMENT GOALS.....6
 - 3.1 CITY’S GOALS6
 - 3.2 RESIDENT’S GOALS6
- 4.0 THE RESULT OF APPROVING *MORE THAN 3,850* NEW HOUSING UNITS7
 - 4.1 ECONOMIC EFFECT ON RESIDENTS AND TO THE CITY7
 - 4.2 WORSE JOB/HOUSING BALANCE7
 - 4.3 SUB OPTIMAL BENEFIT FROM CURRENTLY AVAILABLE LANDS ZONED FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT7
 - 4.4 WORSE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR RESIDENTS7
 - 4.5 A QUESTIONABLE OUTCOME REGARDING THE LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF THIS DEVELOPMENT8
 - 4.6 QUESTIONABLE ACHIEVEMENT ON THE GOAL OF GREATLY EXPANDED AMENITIES FOR RESIDENTS8
 - 4.7 MINIMAL PROGRESS ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING8
 - 4.8 WORSE TRANSPORTATION SITUATION8
 - 4.9 DIMINISHED RESIDENT CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT-LED PROCESS8
 - 4.10 CFD OPTION WOULD DIMINISH THE CITY/DISTRICT 8’S BONDING CAPACITY8
- 5.0 PROPOSAL9
 - 5.1 PROPOSAL FOR THE FOUR (4) PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SITE9
 - 5.1.1 *Arcadia Site*9
 - 5.1.2 *Campus Industrial Site*10
 - 5.1.3 *Evergreen Valley College Site*10
 - 5.1.4 *Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site*11
 - 5.2 ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS, PRECONDITIONS, AND OBLIGATIONS11
 - 5.3 PRESERVE THE DESIGNATION AND TRAFFIC POLICIES OF THE EDP12
 - 5.4 INVESTIGATE RESOLUTION TO THE HWY 101 PROBLEM ON A REGIONAL BASIS12
 - 5.5 INVESTIGATE TIMING FOR LIGHT RAIL12
 - 5.6 FAIRLY JUDGE THE OUTCOMES IN TERMS OF REVENUES TO SUPPORT AMENITIES12
 - 5.7 INVESTIGATE NEW INDUSTRIAL STRATEGIES12
 - 5.8 INVESTIGATE OTHER METHODS OF FUNDING THE AMENITIES BESIDES CFD13
 - 5.9 RISK13
 - 5.9.1 *Risk to Evergreen Residents, if the project are being build and Existing Evergreen Development Policy being weakened*13
 - 5.9.2 *Risk to Land owners, if the project are being build*13
 - 5.9.3 *Risk to Evergreen Residents, if the NO development occurs*13
 - 5.9.4 *Risk to Land owner, if the project are not approved*14
 - 5.10 FINANCIAL/SUPPORTABILITY ANALYSIS FOR THE COST OF INFRASTRUCTURE/AMENITIES14
- 6.0 CONCLUSION.....14
- 7.0 REFERENCED DOCUMENTS.....15



7.1	<u>EVERGREEN * EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY / EVERGREEN VISIONING PROJECT DOCUMENT</u>	15
7.2	<u>MEETING MINUTES</u>	15
7.3	<u>REPORT</u>	16
7.4	<u>ORDINANCE, POLICY, AND GUIDELINE</u>	16
7.5	<u>DEVELOPMENT PLANS</u>	17
7.6	<u>MEMORANDUM</u>	18
7.7	<u>TRAFFIC</u>	19
7.8	<u>ENVIRONMENT</u>	20
7.9	<u>101 OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT</u>	20
7.10	<u>SCHOOL</u>	21
7.11	<u>COSTS OF DEVELOPMENT</u>	21
7.12	<u>RETAIL</u>	21
7.13	<u>NEWS ARTICLES</u>	22
8.0	ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	23



1.0 INTRODUCTION

A founding ideal of the United States is simultaneous respect for the will and wants of the majority as well as for the rights and responsibilities of the minority. The question of further development in District 8 is a perfect test of that ideal. A group of residents have joined together to develop a proposal that meets the needs of both the majority and the minority.

Traffic problems are evident throughout District 8 and they affect neighboring districts too. Growth in population has strained recreational and other amenities residents depend upon for a high standard of living. Schools suffer from the outcome of past development. Landowners desire to develop properties to profit from past investments. The City struggles with delivering services in an environment where the State siphons funds that could otherwise be used to address traffic and amenity shortfalls. What is clear is that traffic relief is imperative and that amenities are needed to maintain a vibrant quality of life. These new amenities are also needed to offset the ill effect of traffic problems as well as to improve the standard of living. Reports and analyses cannot adequately describe the pain of these traffic problems as well as the consequent congestion we all feel; we feel it in our shops, local service businesses, banks, post office, libraries, schools, etc.

Any plan for development in District 8 must meet the needs of residents, developers, and the City. All need to acknowledge that development must be financially viable for landowners as well as viable relative to enduring interests of District 8 residents and the City. This is a challenging balance to strike but the residents who have developed this proposal and the supporting evidence believe we have done so. By acting responsibly, we believe our plan deserves full consideration and adoption by the Task Force. We also believe that quality of life issues cannot be resolved *solely* via development in District 8. All parties have a contribution to make including the City in future budget allocations for parks, roads, etc. and in pursuing at the county, state, and federal level the funds necessary to maintain and enhance the regional assets involved, e.g., Highway 101.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Further residential and commercial development within San Jose Council District 8 (referred to as the Evergreen-East Hills area) presents opportunities to enhance the quality of life but these carry specific costs. These critical decisions have implications and repercussions for both District 8 residents **as well as** the entire City of San Jose. The citywide as well as regional outcomes of any proposed development are substantial and long lasting. For example, improving Highway 101 freeway involves the freeway as well Capitol Expressway and very significant portion of city streets traffic infrastructure. Creating and expanding community parks and recreational facilities as well as further addition of affordable housing through developer funding is an uncommon opportunity in these times of greatly reduced funding from traditional Federal, State and local government sources.

It is a fact that further development within District 8 is nearly guaranteed to worsen the quality of life and congestion issues experienced by residents. Almost any further development creates conflicts with existing San Jose City and District 8 specific traffic levels of service policies as well as policies related to converting industrially-zoned lands to residential housing. We also believe development **will occur** in District 8. We also strongly believe that this proposal is the best compromise in terms of allowing development while also protecting and enhancing the quality of life in Districts 5, 7, and 8. This proposal is designed to provide all needed traffic infrastructure enhancement as well as the requested community amenities with only the necessary, sufficient, and reasonable number of housing units that maintains the quality of life and minimizes the negative effect to our environment while also ensuring landowners and developers' a fair and adequate return of investment.



2.1 Current Development Policy

Transportation challenges and the need for flood protection substantially constraints development in District 8.

The original 1976 *Evergreen Development Policy* (EDP), adopted in August of 1976, addressed the issues of flood protection and traffic capacity in the Evergreen area. The 1976 EDP established the policy framework for dealing with the build out of the Evergreen portion of District 8 and identified specific programs for correcting the service deficiencies.

- ❖ For traffic, the level of service (LOS) must be maintained at LOS “D”.
- ❖ For flooding, development could proceed only if 100-year flood protection was in place for each project and downstream of each project.

Since 1975, growth in the Evergreen area has been controlled by the availability of urban services, particularly the capacities of the transportation and flood control systems.

The current version of EDP, which adopted by the City Council on May 9, 1995, reaffirmed the original EDP traffic goal of overall LOS “D” and the hydrologic goal of 100-year flood protection.

2.2 Traffic Situation

*The Evergreen area of San Jose is the most congested residential area of San Jose. Ten local intersections have a traffic level of service of “E” or “F”.
--- Wayne K. Tanda, Director of Transportation, City of San Jose*

The existing Evergreen Development Policy (EDP) regarding traffic is being violated at almost all major intersections by past and current development, and is at LOS E & F at most key locations. Under current policy, additional development cannot take place unless traffic conditions are improved. We are addressing development in this proposal but it is also important to state that the City has a prior commitment and obligation to comply with its policies. Separate from the development potential, we would like to state that an overriding priority for the District is for the City to make whatever modifications are necessary to come into compliance with its existing policies. Part of that effort to be compliant is to delay new housing development until the existing policy is being complied with.

2.3 Project Impact to the Environment and the Quality of Life including congestion

According to the “Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy Environmental Impact Report” dated February 2006, Converting the land preserved for job growth will result in the potential loss of more than 10,000 future jobs. We would like to underscore this issue. The loss of jobs is a very serious problem with very large implications for future City’s revenue stream. The City may reap some short-term benefit from industrial conversion but we see a tremendous long-term loss. Traffic will get much worse at all major intersections along Capitol Expressway and all 15 segments of HWY 101 and HWY 280 adjacent to District 8.

The existing EDP policy violation reduces quality of life, and worsens the environment:

- ❖ Evergreen is being subjected to over 1.2 million pounds of air pollutants each year
(6.6 grams/minute * 10 minutes * 300 days * 28,000 cars) = 554,400,000 grams per year
554,400,000 grams / 1000 grams per kg * 2.2 kg per lb = 1,219,680 pounds per year
- ❖ Evergreen suffers from 5 million pounds of Carbon Dioxide air pollution every year.
(9.5 ounces/car * 300 day * 28,000 cars) = 79,800,000 ounces per year = 4,987,500 pounds per year



- ❖ Evergreen residents already waste 739,762 gallons of gasoline per year
(100 liters * 28,000 cars / 3.785 liters per gallon = 739,762 gallons)

Above calculations are based on the following very conservative assumptions, the actual situation is worse

- Every home in Evergreen has only ONE car
- We use our car 300 days per year
- Average delay time cause by over build only 10 minutes per day

Source of data:

- Every 30 minutes of idling burns nearly one-tenth of a gallon in wasted fuel – and more than three-tenths of a gallon if your vehicle has an eight-cylinder engine. Idling uses about 0.026 gallons of gasoline for every 10 minutes, which costs us about 5 cents. This adds up to about 9.5 ounces of Carbon Dioxide for those 10 minutes.
<http://www.hcdoes.org/airquality/vehicles/IdleFAQ.htm>
- The US EPA estimates that for every minute a typical auto engine sits idling it emits 6.6 grams of pollutants such as volatile organic compounds, nitrous oxides, and carbon dioxide.
<http://www.grinningplanet.com/2003/roman-digest/environmental-issue-14.htm>
- Idling your vehicle for as little as 10 minutes a day uses an average of 100 liters of gas a year
<http://www.region.peel.on.ca/health/smog/idling.htm>

2.4 Proposed Development Sites

There are four proposed development sites and a group of non-location specified development known as background units within District 8.

2.4.1 Arcadia Site

The Arcadia property is a 83.82 acre site that is located just south of the Eastridge Shopping Mall. The Arcadia site currently includes 4 different zoning.

Arcadia has 33.43 acres zoned as R-1-8 with 217 housing units allocation that can be built now. Areas surrounding the Arcadia Site are zoned as Single-Family residential R-1-8, with Minimum Lot Size of 5.445 square feet.



Arcadia Site			
	APN	Acres	Current Zoning
1.	67029020	23.70	Industrial Park
2.	67029017	11.13	Office
3.	67029020	33.43	R-1-8
4.	67029017	15.56	Public/Quasi-Public

* Public/Quasi-Public is the designation used for public land uses such as schools, fire stations, libraries and community centers



2.4.2 Campus Industrial Site

The Campus Industrial Site located along the east side of Yerba Buena Road adjacent to the Evergreen Specific Plan area.

This site located at the eastern side of Evergreen accessible only by cars. The traffic pattern is one-way flow through two key streets in the East-West direction. Current AM traffic time between ESP and HWY 101 is 23 minute (3.5 miles).

Despite the traffic implications of development in this site, the Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy provide no meaningful traffic improvement to the access roads which **already** at capacity.



Campus Industrial Site			
	APN	Acres	Current Zoning
1.	65902007	87.10	Campus Industrial
2.	66033005	244.05	Campus Industrial

The original zoning was two dwelling units per acre, the site was re-zoned to A(PD) through Berryessa Land Swap. The neighborhood right next to the Campus Industrial site is encompasses the Evergreen Specific Plan, contains 856 acres of land with approval for building 2,996 houses.



The Evergreen Specific Plan includes a commercial village center that is the retail, activity, circulation, and visual hub of the ESP and its surrounding area. The existing of the village center is under real threat due to the Evergreen Community College District's request for approval of a major supermarket at the college site. As the City's planning staff noticed, such proposal would severely impact the village's anchor store by dilute the already weak consumer markets.

2.4.3 Evergreen Valley College Site

The Proposed 27 acre site is located in the western portion of the campus. The Community College District offices and a criminal justice training center occupy part of the 27 acres. This is the last available land in the campus, once developed; there will not have any land for future academic expansion in the campus. Currently, there is a shortage of parking space, which the College would like to rectify by using Measure G money to build a parking structure instead of converting part of the 27 acres into parking lot.





The College site is zoned as R-1-5, but there is no housing unit allocation preventing any commercial or residential development since the site is designated as Public/Quasi-Public. The site's surrounding neighborhoods are all zoned as R-1-5, which provide for a minimum lot size is 8,000 sq. ft.

The developer's proposal would construct 6-story buildings (see EIR p. 300) that require a "High-Rise Level I" structure response in the event of a fire. This response consists of three engine companies, two truck companies, and two Battalion Chiefs. Truck company response becomes critical in such responses because the aerial ladders provide a stable platform for extricating entrapped victims from external windows and balconies. The closest trucks to the College properties are too far to meet the 10-minutes response goal. The SJFD estimates the capital cost of a ladder truck at one million dollars and the annual cost for personnel to staff the truck is estimated at \$2.1 million.

Benefits received by the college through the construction of high-rise level I building would not be able to offset the cost of required fire protection and other city services.

The developer's proposal violates the City Council's EEHVS Vision and Expected Outcomes because its density and heights is not compatible to the adjacent properties (guiding principles #2). The developer's proposal also exceeds the height limit set by the General Plan.

Evergreen College believes that they can pursue some residential development without General Plan change as long as it is for faculty, staff or student housing. It is not clear how viable this contention is given the lack of funds to develop housing and a number of deed restrictions limiting increase in price and possibly requiring houses to be re-sold to the College.

Eleven supermarkets already existed within 3.5 miles of the college site, with the site-specific sales performance range from \$150 to \$290 per square foot that fell short of the \$400 per square foot threshold benchmark. With four supermarkets (Albertson, Savemart, Lunardis, and Consentino) are near the College site, adding another supermarket at the College site will have an adverse impact to other existed supermarkets. In 1996, the College excluded a full service grocery operation in the proposed Evergreen College site, for the reason "Not adversely impact the commercial Village Center in the Evergreen Planned residential community."

2.4.4 Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site

The Pleasant Hills Golf Course property is a 114-acre site that is located in the northeast quadrant of the Tully Road/White Road intersection. The property is unincorporated.

The current land use designation is Private Recreation and the current zoning is A (Agriculture). The Golf Course was closed in 2004. Prior to this closure and since, the City has not actively pursued keeping the Golf Course open and in operation as a golf course.

Areas surrounding the Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site are all zoned as Single-Family residential R-1-8. According to "San Jose Municipal Code Title 20, The Zoning Ordinance" Table 20-60, The Minimum Lot Size is 5,445 square feet.





3.0 DEVELOPMENT GOALS

3.1 City's Goals

The City has a number of goals that it strives to meet when considering development. These include:

- Striking a balance between jobs and housing We believe that our plan is right in line with that goal since we are providing for an increase in housing stock, amenities for the new homeowners to enjoy, and we are preserving jobs which the current designation is meant to encourage. As well, development of retail and other commercial uses is possible based on the preliminary work already done.
- Promote economic development Our plan promotes economic development. Beyond preserving the industrial base, new housing development will drive new economic activity and it will also create a more sustainable economic base when it is finished. In addition, we expect more housing will moderate the rise in home costs especially as our plan has made strict provisions for affordable housing. Finally, commercial development is expected to complement and enhance residential development.
- Promote a good quality of life Amenities are to be substantially funded along with within-District traffic improvements. The balance we have struck in terms of the number of homes proposed and improvements to amenities and traffic will make an important contribution to preserving long-term quality of life including congestion management.
- Make housing more affordable Our program has set aside a large proportion of the units to be affordable.
- Improve transportation Our program is focused on providing dollars to make necessary within-District transportation improvements although with new amenities effecting traffic levels management is needed. We expect our plan to be successful by also promoting alternative means of transit thereby easing the strain on the existing and planned traffic improvement.

3.2 Resident's Goals

Residents have made clear that their priorities are to maintain and affirm the existing **Evergreen Development Policy (EDP), especially preventing any further traffic deterioration in a situation of already unacceptable congestion on local street**, and for striking a balancing between housing and creating jobs locally within the district. Residents support and believe in economic development that can also protect and enhance the quality of life including and especially managing congestion. With proper planning, residents also support the goal of increasing the stock of affordable housing. Finally, residents also support making the various public transport options work in coordination with one another so as to deliver the best complement to personal transportation.

Above all residents are interested and committed to great expanding the quality and variety of public amenities. Residents also wish to help address the overcrowding in schools through smart land use planning wherever possible.

Our plan enables residents to achieve these multiple objectives.



4.0 THE RESULT OF APPROVING *MORE THAN 3,850* NEW HOUSING UNITS

Land use decisions should align with the community interest not merely maximize landowner development value. Failing to consider the long-term community interest will result in a degraded quality of life, forestall meaningful transportation infrastructure support, and create significant unavoidable effects on the environment.

4.1 Economic effect on residents and to the City

The economic cost of over development is severe. Residents will be wasting gas as they wait at congested transit corridors. The current estimate of over development projects that District 8 residents will pay over \$2.4 million dollars per year for the gasoline that was wasted on traffic congestion caused by over-development. Congestion has other pernicious effects that degrade the quality of life. The infrastructure expenses of overbuilding are also high. For example, the fire protection cost for the High-Rise housing structure in the Arcadia site and the College site will exceed \$2 million dollars per year. If the housing density in the Arcadia and the College site is compatible with their adjacent neighborhoods, the High-Rise housing protection will not be necessary, and all City residents save this \$2 million dollars per year since the fire department's funding is from the overall San Jose budget

4.2 Worse Job/Housing balance

If the current policy is over turned, rather than having space to create a large number of industrial and commercial jobs, all the emphasis will be placed on housing. This is not sound planning. Our plan emphasizes local jobs for local residents. This is a worthwhile and achievable goal that our proposal makes more likely.

4.3 Sub optimal benefit from currently available lands zoned for industrial development

The existing designation of lands for industrial development was always intended to create balanced development within the City. Making these areas exclusively developed for residential purposes breaks this model. It is unsound from a long-term prosperity basis. In addition, it is equally unsound to focus on industrial development based in large campus projects of the 1970's and 1980's. What is needed is a much more diversified view of industrial development to focus on and support creation of smaller enterprises that will create large numbers of jobs that fit well with the local jobs – local housing model.

4.4 Worse quality of life for residents

A mix of residential, commercial, and industrial development will lessen the strain caused by having to commute to jobs in other parts of the City and County. It is possible to have residents live close to where they work if the existing Campus Industrial land use designation is preserved. Excessive residential development will worsen an already congested area and further blight the air. Better traffic mitigation in combination with controlled increase in residential housing stock is the right solution. Deteriorating air quality is just one of the negative outcomes residents are experiencing. Adding to the situation is unreasonable and unwarranted. Finally, the plan we are proposing has specific elements to address overcrowded school District residents have to contend with *already*. Our plan for development address the need for schools and it has been created with the input from and coordination with the local school districts. Implementation will require serious cooperation and coordination. By bringing the school districts concerns into the planning process, we have developed a plan more likely to be accepted by the school districts.



4.5 A questionable outcome regarding the long-term sustainability of this development.

The allowance of a project that is not a mix of industrial, commercial, and residential will create a sustainability problem. The tax and revenue generating potential of a residential-only approach will not enable development to pay its way in the years ahead. That is unsound.

4.6 Questionable achievement on the goal of greatly expanded amenities for residents

The proposals that have been floated hold up as a shiny object a long list of amenities but these are a false hope. First, the excessive traffic and congestion will make it harder to enjoy these amenities. Second, the City has an obligation to provide amenities to its residents. Making excessive residential development a condition for obtaining those amenities is an instance of bad governance and it is inconsistent with the historic pattern in San Jose. The community is contributing a substantial amount to creating the needed amenities. The City needs to do its part to generate the funds needed. Finally, the proposed list of amenities has still not been fully evaluated and scrubbed. As part of moving towards development, the list needs to be revised and prioritize for the available fund. This is reason why making District 8 development a part of an overall citywide General Plan update is *advisable*.

4.7 Minimal progress on affordable housing

The plan we are proposing accommodates affordable housing needs. IF, however, our sensible proposal is not adopted and the industrial lands are developed, they will emphasize large residential units that will sell for much more than the affordable housing threshold. We argue instead for a healthy mix of residential, commercial, and industrial development ensures that we have the economic wherewithal and base for future additions of affordable housing. Affordable housing is important to long-term sustainable economic growth. The careful blending of housing and economic development will create a far more livable and sustainable community.

4.8 Worse transportation situation

Without a mixed, balanced development program, traffic will be worse and resulting congestion will make the quality of life worse on a permanent basis. Traffic relief is needed and funds are required to do so. However, making District 8 bear the full cost of traffic relief by engaging in *excessive* residential development to pay for needed relief is wrong and should not be adopted. A far more equitable solution is to combine the resources generated by this plan to fund a substantial portion of inter-district traffic relief and amenities along with working on a regional, statewide, and federal basis to fund the improvements to Highway 101 and any other major traffic artery involved.

4.9 Diminished resident confidence in government-led process

Residents participated in this process with the expectation that their voices would be heard. Instead the opposite appears to be happening. If this proposal is accepted, it will be absolute proof that the voices of residents do matter and are accounted for in important not just in superficial ways.

4.10 CFD option would diminish the city/district 8's bonding capacity

A Community Facilities District is the wrong way to go. The original idea was to create a fund that the City could not tap to pay for other projects including regular operating expenses. The proposal of a CFD is an attempt to shift the burden from the developers to homeowners. This



is a patently bad idea unwarranted given that the developers are going to keep all the profit from the development. A CFD is also bad because it diminishes the bonding capacity for District 8.

5.0 PROPOSAL

Our Proposal for Maximum Housing Units Allowed

	Arcadia	Berg/IDS	Legacy	Golf Course	College	Background	
							Retain Campus Industrial
Large Lot Conventional	0	450	0	200	0		
Small Lot Conventional	0	150	0	150	0		
Small Lot	0	125	0	150	0		
Town Home	700	75	0	100	0		
Multi-Family	700	0	0	0	0		
Affordable/Work	400	0	0	0	250		
							Total
Total units	1800	800	0	600	250	400	3850
Net acres	81	200	120	114	27		542

5.1 Proposal for the four (4) proposed development site

The proposals for each site are intended to strike a balance between meeting the needs of all stakeholders. By carefully considering existing densities, traffic, job preservation, school, and congestion management, we have developed an overall program that can deliver very satisfactory results for the District, the City, and for the region. We focused on creating a sensible program for development while preserving residential quality of life even as we generated a large pool of resources for beneficial improvement.



Another major goal for this program was to maintain consistency with the Guiding Principles. These Principles provide good direction for making the outcome favorable for all. The Principles are not, strictly speaking, a development checklist. Rather, they express the desires of the community that need to be addressed for maximum sustainability.

http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/evergreen/pdf/att3_GuidingPrinciples.pdf

The bottom line – we should be generating traffic relief and creating a set of amenities that will genuinely enhance rather than diminish residential quality of life.

5.1.1 Arcadia Site

Development in Arcadia is transit-oriented. Therefore, no development can be permitted until light rail or alternative transit “breaks ground” for a Capitol Expressway/Nieman Station. In the event mass transit development does not occur, development should adhere to the existing zoning.



We support the use of Knights Foundation (Charette) land use concepts for Arcadia site, under such concepts, the West Evergreen SNI proposed for development of 1,690 units

- i. Multi-family (for rent) 960 units
- ii. Multi-family (for sale) 330 units
- iii. Single-family attached (for sale) 380 units

We also support the following land use concept that will create a productive and viable land use benefiting the entire community:

- I. Multi-family 700 units
- II. Single-family attached 700 units
- III. Seniors/Retirees affordable 400 units
- IV. Ownership / Rental ratio 60/40
- V. 100,000 square feet of retail space
- VI. Additional acreage for an elementary school
- VII. Construct an Adult Sports Complex and Community/Youth Center at the Arcadia site per West Evergreen Neighborhood Improvement Plan



5.1.2 Campus Industrial Site

Due to the unique location of this site, no public transit system is available nor bring planned. To minimize incremental, significant traffic and environmental impact, we believed it is best to use the original zoning of 2 DU/AC. To satisfy the City’s goals of striking a balance between jobs and housing, compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods, and compliance with the existing Evergreen Development Policy, we propose the following:



For the Campus Industrial Site

- I. Retain the Legacy property (120 acres) for industrial development
- II. Large Lot Conventional 450
- III. Small Lot Conventional 150
- IV. Small Lot 125
- V. Town Home 75
- VI. Complete the Fowler Creek Park per “The Fowler Creek Park Master Plan”
- VII. Allocate 15 acre of land for the construction of a new elementary/middle school (K-8) in the Campus Industrial property as requested by the Evergreen School District

5.1.3 Evergreen Valley College Site

The Evergreen Valley College’s last 27 acres of land should be preserved for educational related use. However, assuming that the development will not compromise the core mission of the College, we support the following productive, viable land use of the land that benefits the community without harming existing, neighborhood retail centers:





- I. Maximum of 250 housing units that will be affordable to educational and/or public service employees.
- II. A new library service branch of up to 23,000 square feet in size that will be built from currently available funding supplied by the San Jose Branch Library Bond Measure.
- III. A one-acre park; if the public library is not located at the college site, the park should be increase to three acres in size. (to satisfy the city’s neighborhood and community serving recreational service level requirement)
- IV. No grocery store at this site.
- V. Up to 100,000 square feet of office/retail space which may included:
 - a. A medical/dental office Center
 - b. Additional office spaces
 - c. A major bookstore to serve its largely professional neighbors
 - d. Bedding and house-wares store for the surrounding newly established neighborhood.
 - e. We do not support a grocery store for this site.

5.1.4 Pleasant Hills Golf Course Site

For the Golf Course site, a total of 600 new housing units are proposed. This is consistent with the current density in the area.

- I. Large Lot Conventional 200
- II. Small Lot Conventional 150
- III. Small Lot 150
- IV. Town Home 100
- V. Fire Station
- VI. Light commercial / office space
- VII. 60% residential development and 40% non-residential usage include open space, park, school, etc....
- VIII. 10 acres of land shall be reserved in the Pleasant Hills Golf Course property for the Mount Pleasant Elementary School District to construct a new school



5.2 Additional Development Assumptions, Preconditions, and Obligations

- a) All within District traffic infrastructure improvements and amenities are funded 100% through land owner/developer contributions with triggers developed that ensure that a critical mass of in-District traffic relief and amenities are created prior to the start of development. Landowners will recover their investment in infrastructure from gross sales revenues. A buyer funded Community Facilities District (CFD) mechanism shall not be used.
- b) Mitigate traffic levels to assure LOS D or better but no worse than the 1995 EDP requirements
- c) Approval for new housing development requires breaking ground on Highway 101 improvements. Not all improvements need be completed but ground must be broken before new housing development would proceed.
- d) Breaking ground for new housing development requires demonstration of compliance with existing EDP traffic policy.
- e) Street and parking design will accommodate a free flow of traffic with adequate parking to accommodate additional unit occupancy growth.
- f) All development will be planned following current development design guidelines without variance
- g) Follow the Parkland Dedication Ordinance in affect at the time of development plan approval



- h) Follow the City of San Jose Riparian Corridor Policy without variance
- i) All interfaces with existing adjacent neighborhoods will be at their current density and compatible architecture
- j) Set aside funds to be used by the East Side Union High School District for school capital improvements.
- k) Provide assistance to reserve a sufficient amount of land for use by the East Side Union High School District in the southeastern portion of the District (south of the Task Force area under consideration) for a future school site. (Reference: ESUHSD Superintendent's memo dated April 6, 2006)
 - o The ESUHSD has an existing capacity to accommodate an additional 4,000 students (EIR, February 2006, p. 306)
 - o Adjustment of the current school attendance boundaries is currently under way which will resolve any overcrowd/under-utilize problem. (Boundary Change Goals, February 2, 2006)

Additional Policy Recommendations to Guide Implementation

5.3 Preserve the designation and traffic policies of the EDP

The Evergreen Development Policy (EDP) should not be weakened. EDP demonstrated a forward and effective strategy for accommodating in growth. The policies were designed in a sensible manner and their implementation has been the real issue. Now is an opportunity to mend without breaking these well-considered policies. The funds generated by this plan allow for in-District traffic relief and these funds can also make future adherence to policy much more likely. We are in the fortunate position to see the fruits of god planning in action. Our plan makes a strong statement about enforcing and supporting the EDP traffic policies for *all* of District 8.

5.4 Investigate resolution to the HWY 101 problem on a regional basis

Highway 101 is a regional asset. The obligation of the City is to pursue regional solutions to regional problems. Highway 101 is vital to the whole of San Jose, to surrounding cities, to surrounding counties, and indeed to the whole Bay Area. We expect that patient, diligent seeking out of funds can be successful although it will surely take time. It is more than shortsighted to burden a single city district with the development needed to fix this important regional asset.

5.5 Investigate timing for light rail

The goal is to synchronize construction of the new housing in Arcadia to coincide with the availability of light rail service. These two developments should be brought online more or less in lockstep.

5.6 Fairly judge the outcomes in terms of revenues to support amenities

Adopt a scorecard to fairly judge the outcomes in terms of revenues to support amenities and preserve amenities as the goal of allowing any development. Same for transportation improvements within District 8 and between District 7 and District 5. This should address the sustainability issue not fully address in the current plan.

5.7 Investigate new industrial strategies

Business and trade have changed dramatically since the late 1980's. Contemporary entrepreneurial strategies emphasize small, flexible operations. New, substantial



opportunities exist for stimulating commercial and industrial development. The existing model for generating industrial development in District 8 is out-of-date. A large anchor industrial presence may be a part of the long-term story but it is not the entire long-term story. What is needed is a plan based on small and midsize enterprises operating on conditions that are dynamic and which require flexibility and responsiveness. The land to support this strategy is the Legacy Property although the understanding of the authors of this plan is that the whole district can ride this new wave too. The District is seeking entirely new types of commercial uses range from health care oriented to new types of service concepts. The availability of land at the College, for example, to meet these needs is part of viewing the world in a new way.

5.8 Investigate other methods of funding the amenities besides CFD

The landowners wish to build in District 8. They have made the business risk decision to own the land they have. It is only reasonable to make the risk of development a function of their business decisions. This plan requires that they invest in public infrastructure and recover that investment from the sales of the housing and commercial product they develop. This seems the only reasonable path.

5.9 Risk

5.9.1 Risk to Evergreen Residents, if the project are being build and Existing Evergreen Development Policy being weakened

- a) Significant unavoidable additional traffic congestion
- b) Loss of the EDP level of service (LOS) traffic protection
- c) Over two million dollars wasted on gasoline that is directly due to traffic congestion
- d) A worsening of the quality of life and the environment (see paragraph 2.3 for more detail)

5.9.2 Risk to Land owners, if the project are being build

- a) The known risk is due to delaying housing development. Delay is financially costly.
- b) There is no financial exposure for landowners even if they have to bear the upfront cost of traffic mitigation. These costs should be viewed as part of the cost of doing business. The landowners reap a significant profit from development. Upon rezoning to residential development, a 4:1 increase in land values will result yielding a new value for the land reserved for residential development. The new value rises fourfold to 1.25M to 1.5M dollars per acre. By contrast, the traffic improvement package is equivalent to only 20% of their new land value. The profit to the landowners rises further if the City is successful is tapping regional, state, and federal dollars to pay for 101 improvements.

5.9.3 Risk to Evergreen Residents, if the NO development occurs

There is no known risk to the residents; in fact, there will be much better long-term benefits for the Evergreen residents to maintain the status quo.

- a) No development means no risk of more traffic congestion. Long term, a great many traffic problems will be avoided.
 - The major inter-Evergreen traffic improvement proposed by the project is simply a repainting of streets creating more left or right turn lanes, which should be done through normal maintenance *anyway*.
 - The 101 improvements is a regional issue and listed on the Regional Highway Priority List, under normal circumstance, it may receive funding from State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in two years. The only reason to propose these necessary 101 improvements be paid for by EEHVS is because the State has no money. Three years ago, it was true that the State of California was in



real, severe financial difficulty. Since then, the financial situation has improved, and the governor just proposed a ten-year plan for \$105 billion transportation improvement.

- b) No risk of a decrease in the quality of life
- c) No risk of an increase in air pollution

5.9.4 Risk to Land owner, if the project are not approved

- a) There is no risk of financial loss on the land investment. Moreover the upside for substantial additional value remains whenever the use is converted from its current undeveloped state to a developed state.
- b) Loss substantial amount of fees paid to lobbyist, consultants and the City without return of investment.
- c) Loss of profit from land conversion (according to real estate expert, the current land price vs. the land being rezoned to proposed density for residential development is 1:4)
- d) Lost opportunity to develop their landholdings for the foreseeable future

5.10 Financial/supportability analysis for the cost of infrastructure/amenities

- a) Cost of the traffic enhancement

According to the Evergreen Development Policy, no development will occur until the traffic situation is resolved. Therefore, the land owners should pay the cost of traffic improvement as their cost of doing business. The land owners estimated value of the land AFTER rezoning for residential housing development would be 1.25 to 1.5 million dollars per acre. According to real estate experts, the current land value is at most one quarter of that value given existing zoning. Therefore, absorb the cost of the entire traffic mitigation seems fair since this mitigation is equal to only 20% of the land owners' profit from rezoning for residential construction.

- b) Cost of the amenities

The current housing price in the Evergreen area is \$450 to \$500 per square feet. By using the "Variable Contribution Analysis" spreadsheet provide by HMM engineering (the engineering consultants to the land owners) we estimate the cost of development (including cost of the land, cost of construction, cost of fees, cost to provide amenities specified in the EVP document, 15% profit, etc but not including the cost of selling [typically, it would be 3% of the housing price]) would be \$390 per square feet. This is a substantial profit to developers.

6.0 CONCLUSION

This land use development proposal is designed to improve the quality of life, reduce congestion, preserve the jobs-housing balance, enhance within-District transportation, foster economic development, and provide for affordable housing. It strikes a balance between development and residential quality while creating a large pool of resources for improvement, thus creating a win-win partnership for the City. The City can match the very substantial contribution the District is making towards the very real problems residents and the City face. The City also has a duty to provide transportation and to meet the need for amenities. This sharing of risk, reward, and responsibility are essential to purposeful development. Our plan should be adopted as the plan of the Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy.



7.0 REFERENCED DOCUMENTS

7.1 Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy / Evergreen Visioning Project Document

Evergreen Visioning Task Force Recommendations
February 24, 2005

Proposal for Future Development in District 8
EEHVS Task Force, March 15, 2006

Evergreen Development Policy
City of San Jose

Evergreen Visioning Project Amenities List
January 23, 2004

Guiding Principles for land use and transportation planning in Evergreen
Evergreen Visioning Project, November 19, 2003

Vacant Land Inventory
City of San Jose, July 2004

Existing Allocations in Evergreen EDP
City of San Jose, October 31, 2005

Approval of actions to establish funding for the preparation of the Evergreen Community Plan, update of the Evergreen Area Development Policy, and related environmental documents
City of San Jose Council Agenda, November 4, 2003

Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy: Vision and Expected Outcomes
Approved by City Council, June 21, 2006

Proposal for Housing Development in District 8
Property Owners, March 9, 2006

7.2 Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes
Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force (August 2003 – February 2005)

Meeting Minutes
Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy Task Force (August 2005 – Present)

Meeting Minutes
Stakeholder (August 2003 – February 2005)

Owner Representative/Staff Meeting
Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, February 4, 2004 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

Owner Representative/District 8/Staff Meeting
Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, February 12, 2004 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)



Property Owner Representative's Meeting

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, April 7, 2004 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

Area Development Policy Meeting

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, August 10, 2004 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #7

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, August 25, 2004 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

Property Owner Representative's Meeting

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, September 28, 2004 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

Property Owner Representative's Meeting

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, November 3, 2004 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

C3/HMP Meeting

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, January 4, 2005 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

Property Owner Representative's Meeting

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, January 5, 2005 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #8

Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy, March 1, 2005 (EVP Task Force members were uninformed about this meeting)

7.3

Report

Review of Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force's progress

Homing Yip, January 18, 2005

Report on Evergreen Valley Quarterly Status Report

Laura Privetti, March 3, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project Process

Eileen Goodwin, April 15, 2005

The Story of Evergreen Vision Strategy

David Pandori, February 2006

Governor's Budget Summary 2006-2007

Arnold Schwarzenegger, January 10, 2006

7.4

Ordinance, Policy, and Guideline

Zoning Ordinance

San Jose Municipal Code, Title 20

Environmental Clearance

San Jose Municipal Code, Title 21

Park Impact Requirements

San Jose Municipal Code, Chapter 14.25

Parkland Dedication Ordinance

San Jose Municipal Code, Chapter 19.38

Zoning Map 84 *(include Arcadia proposed development site)*

City of San Jose



Zoning Map 85 (include Golf Course site and Campus Industrial proposed development site)
City of San Jose

Zoning Map 101 (include Evergreen College proposed development site)
City of San Jose

Framework, to Evaluate proposed Conversions of Employment Lands to Other Uses
City of San Jose, April 6, 2004

Riparian Corridor Policy Study
City of San Jose, March 1999

Housing Opportunities Study
City of San Jose, August 2004

Transportation Impact Policy
City of San Jose, Rev 11-04

Highway Capacity Manual
Transportation Research Board, Washington DC

Residential Design Guidelines
City of San Jose, April 1999

Commercial Design Guidelines
City of San Jose, May 1990

Industrial Design Guidelines
City of San Jose, August 1992

Landscape and Irrigation Guidelines
City of San Jose, March 1993

7.5 Development Plans

2020 General Plan
City of San Jose

Valley Transportation Plan 2020
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, December 2000

San Jose Public Library Branch Facilities Master Plan
City of San Jose, September 2000

Greenprint, 20 Year Strategic Plan for Parks, Community Facilities and Programs
City of San Jose, September 2000

San Jose Fire Department Strategic Plan
City of San Jose, December 2000

Evergreen Specific Plan
City of San Jose, July 2, 1991

Fowler Creek Park Master Plan
City of San Jose, 1988, revised October 21, 2003



Evergreen-Eastridge Plan

Knight Program in Community Building, November, 2003

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

City of San Jose

Communications Hill Specific Plan

City of San Jose

Midtown Specific Plan

City of San Jose, December 1992

Rincon South Specific Plan

City of San Jose, November 1998

Initial Study for Syntex Evergreen Development

City of San Jose, October 1999

Initial Study for Pacific Rim Science Park

City of San Jose, April 1999

Strong Neighborhoods Initiative Redevelopment Plan

Redevelopment Agency, City of San Jose, June 25, 2002

West Evergreen Neighborhood Improvement Plan

City of San Jose, November 2001

West Evergreen Strong Neighborhoods Initiative

City of San Jose, November 2001

West Evergreen SNI Planning Area

City of San Jose, February 7, 2002

East Valley/680 Communities Strong Neighborhoods Initiative

City of San Jose, November 2001

East Valley/680 Communities SNI Planning Area

City of San Jose, April 25, 2002

KONA Neighborhood Improvement Plan

City of San Jose, 2002

King Ocala Neighborhood Area Strong Neighborhoods Initiative

City of San Jose, December 2002

K.O.N.A. SNI Planning Area

City of San Jose, April 19, 2002

7.6 Memorandum

Adoption of appropriation and funding source resolution amendments in the general fund for the Evergreen land use and transportation study project

Memorandum to the Council by Stephen Haase & Larry Lisenbee, February 18, 2003

Funding Agreement for the Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy and Related Documents

Memorandum to the Council by Stephen Haase, November 3, 2003



Distribution of “Towards the Future: Jobs, Land Use, and Fiscal Issues in San Jose’s Key Employment Areas (2000-2020)”

Memorandum to the City Council by Stephen Haase, February 4, 2004

Framework for Evaluating Proposed Conversions of Employment Lands

Memorandum to the City Council by Del Borgsdorf, March 24, 2004

Evergreen Visioning Project

Memorandum to the Task Force members by Dave Cortese, November 1, 2004

2 EVP Position Statement

Memorandum to the Task Force members by Dave Cortese, January 17, 2005

3 EVP Position Statement

Memorandum to the Task Force members by Dave Cortese, February 2, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project

Memorandum to the TF Citizen, Property Owner, and City Staff by Dave Cortese, March 1, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project/Smart Growth Strategy

Memorandum to the City Council by Stephen Haase, April 12, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project/Smart Growth Strategy

Memorandum to the City Council by Gonzales, Campos and Yeager, April 29, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project / Smart Growth Strategy Task Force

Memorandum to the City Council by Gonzales, Campos and Yeager, May 13, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project

Memorandum to the City Council by Ron Gonzales, May 16, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project: Development Applications

Memorandum to the City Council by Stephen Haase, May 16, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project Study Session

Memorandum to the City Council by Stephen Haase, June 3, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force

Memorandum to the City Council by Gonzales, Cortese and Campos, June 7, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project

Memorandum to the City Council by Stephen Haase, June 16, 2005

Market Retail Study

Memorandum to EEHVS Task Force by Dave Cortese, November 16, 2005

Evergreen East Hills Vision Strategy

Memorandum to the City Council by Joseph Horwedel, April 27, 2006

Evergreen Visioning Project

Memorandum to the City Council by Dave Cortese, May 9, 2006

7.7 Traffic

Capitol Expressway Corridor Environmental Impact Report

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, April 2005

Traffic Volume Study

Department of Streets and Traffic, City of San Jose



Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy Transportation Analysis
Supplemental Materials, May 22, 2004

Summary/Analysis of the “Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy Transportation Analysis”
Evergreen Hills Resident Action Group, June, 2004

7.8 Environment

Environmental Impact Report for the Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy Project
City of San Jose, February 2006

Environmental Impact Report for the Evergreen Specific Plan
City of San Jose, March 1991

Environmental Impact Report for the Evergreen Specific Plan Transportation Improvements
City of San Jose, March 1994

Environmental Impact Report for the Exxon Enterprises Evergreen Industrial Park
City of San Jose, March 1981

Environmental Impact Report for the Syntex USA Evergreen Valley
City of San Jose, June 1981

Environmental Effects That May Be Considered Significant
Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines

What is Environmental Review
City of San Jose, Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

7.9 101 Operational Improvement

Project Study Report
Report to the Council by Wayne Tanda, June 26, 2001

Regional Highway Improvements – Proposed City Priorities
Department of Transportation, City of San Jose, August 28, 2001

Regional Highway Priority List
Report to the Council by Wayne Tanda, August 28, 2001

Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Negotiate and Execute Agreements With VTA
Memorandum to the Council by James Helmer and Larry Lisenbee, October 22, 2001

US 101 Operational Improvement Projects and Cooperative Agreements with the City of San Jose and Caltrans
Memorandum to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority by Carolyn Gonot, July 21, 2004

Workshop Meeting Minutes
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Board of Directors, August 13, 2004

Initial Study for US 101 Operational Improvements from I-280/I-680 to Yerba Buena Road, San Jose
Department of Transportation, State of California, July 2005

US Highway 101 Central Corridor Study
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)



7.10 **School**

ESUHSD Projected Enrollments 2001-2011

Enrollment Projection Consultants, February 2002

ESUHSD Projected Enrollments 2004-2014

Enrollment Projection Consultants, 2005

ESUHSD Boundary Change Goals

Enrollment Projection Consultants, February 2, 2006

ESUHSD Boundary Change Options

Enrollment Projection Consultants, February 3, 2006

ESUHSD Potential Boundary Changes

Enrollment Projection Consultants, February 27, 2006

ESUHSD School district' short and long term needs

Memorandum to the Board of Trustees by the Superintendent, April 6, 2006

Overview of Residential Development Impacts

ESUHSD, November 12, 1991

7.11 **Costs of Development**

NPH Analysis of Bay Area Development Costs

Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California

2004 - 2005 South Bay Area Cost of Development

Home builders Association, January 8, 2005

2003 - 2004 South Bay Area Cost of Development

Home builders Association, October 30, 2003

Feb Evergreen home Sales Info

March 1, 2006

ESP Area New Home Price List

March 2006

ESP Area March-April 2005 housing price

7.12 **Retail**

Evergreen Area Retail Study

Metrovation, September 13, 2005

Concerns Regarding Evergreen Area Retail Study Recommendations

Alfred Gobar Associates, February 6, 2006

Revised GP 96-8-1 (Excluding a full service grocery operation)

Letter from M. Hill to G. Schoennauer, October 23, 1996

Initial Study for Evergreen Retail Center

City of San Jose, March 1999



7.13 News Articles

Make San Jose better, not just bigger with horrific traffic
Mercury News, April 25, 2006

Candidates debate growth vs. quality of life
Mercury News, April 24, 2006

800-home plan stirs opposition
Mercury News, February 21, 2006

Mirassou Winery site under consideration
Evergreen Times, October 24, 2005

EEHVS Task Force tackles stacked agenda
Evergreen Times, September 23, 2005

1,500 IBM workers to leave Hitachi site in early 2006
Mercury News, September 13, 2005

New EEHVS Task Force starts to address growth in Evergreen
Evergreen Times, September 9, 2005

New Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force members appointed
Evergreen Times, June 17, 2005

San Jose council hears planning options for Evergreen.pdf
Mercury News, June 9, 2005

In Evergreen, follow those dollar signs
Mercury News, May 26, 2005

Dave's Bizarre Double-Take
Metro Active, May 25, 2005

Council OKs Evergreen task force
Mercury News, May 18, 2005

Council to consider rival task forces on Evergreen growth
Mercury News, May 17, 2005

Clovis Mirassou, ran winery
Mercury News, May 18, 2005

San Jose Development 101
San Jose Inside, April 27, 2005

Paying for Coyote Valley
Mercury News, April 21, 2005

Evergreen housing plan overhauled
Mercury News, April 20, 2005

Housing idea spurs traffic concerns
Mercury News, April 19, 2005

Moves abound to change environmental law to build more housing!
Associated Press, April 4, 2005

City, county are close on deal to avoid trial
San Jose Business Journal, April 2, 2005



Developers, residents seek balance

Mercury News, March 3, 2005

Developers, residents seek balance

Mercury News, March 3, 2005

Evergreen Visioning Project takes shape

Evergreen Times, February 25, 2005

Questions lingering for Evergreen Area

Mercury News, July 1, 2004

High-rise proposal for Fountain Alley flouts city's rules

Mercury News, September 30, 2004

Charming, unique, endangered

Mercury News, August 23, 2004

Council should examine Evergreen plan up front

Mercury News, July 26, 2004

Pleasant Hills Golf Course scheduled to close today

Mercury News, August 30, 2004

Last round played at Pleasant Hills

Mercury News, October 1, 2004

Shaping the future landscape of Evergreen

Evergreen Times, June 29, 2004

8.0 ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Acronyms and abbreviations used throughout this proposal are defined in the following list.

CFD	Community Facilities District
DU/AC	Dwelling Units per Acre
EDP	Evergreen Development Policy
EEHVS	Evergreen * East Hills Vision Strategy
EIR	Environment Impact Report
ESGS	Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy
ESP	Evergreen Specific Plan
ESUHSD	East Side Union High School District
EVP	Evergreen Visioning Project
HWY	High Way
KONA	King Ocala neighborhood Area
LOS	Levels of Service
SEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
SJFD	San Jose Fire Department
SNI	Strong Neighborhoods Initiative
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
VTA	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority