

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force

Date/Time: January 12, 2005 at 6:30 p.m.

Location: Evergreen Valley High School, 3300 Quimby Road

Task Force Members Present:

Alan Covington, Chris Corpus, Daniel Gould, Daniel Jacobs, Homing Yip, Ike White, Jenny Chang, Jim Zito, José Aranda, Khanh Nguyen, Lillian Jones, Lou Kvitek, Mark Milioto, Mike Alvarado (Vice Chair), Sherry Gilmore, Steve Tedesco (Chair), Tian Zhang, Victor Klee, Vikki Lang, Vince Songcayawon

Members of the Public Present:

Dave Zenker, Maria Sinatra, Katja Irvin, Bob Rivet, Bill Jibby, Tony Seebach, Lori Truitt, Pat Sausedo, Robert Tedrow Theresa Cearley, Carolyn Bushnell, Mary Lou Da Silva, Carlos Da Silva, Tony Montagano, Barbara Schwartz, Terry Gotcher, Kelly Gutierrez, Jeanette Newman, Jennifer Dinis, Charles Perrotta, Rommel Sanol, Ellie Glass, Evelyn Mills, Ivy Sarratt, Mary Kolb, Joe Marques Sr.

Developer Community Present:

Bo Radanovich, Bonnie Moss, Gerry DeYoung, Mike Keaney, Tom Armstrong, Myron Crawford, Henry Cord

Staff Present:

Council Member Dave Cortese, Laurel Prevetti, Dave Mitchell, Andrew Crabtree, John Baty, Rabia Chaudhry

A. Old Business

Meeting called to order at 6:44 p.m.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved and the current agenda confirmed.

No report on status of open items.

No progress report.

B. Approve Chair / Vice Chair for February Meeting

Sherry Gilmore's nomination of Mike Alvarado for the Chair of the February Task Force meeting was approved.

Tian Zhang's nomination of Homing Yip for the Vice Chair of the February Task Force meeting was approved.

C. Approve of EVP Operating Procedures

MOTION by Alan Covington to approve EVP Operating Procedures

AMENDED by Homing Yip to keep the current meeting minutes with appendix format
MOTION APPROVED as AMENDED

D. Clarification of Key Elements of EVP Process & EIR Constraints

Handouts: Key Elements Diagram, Key Products and EIR Process

Laurel Prevetti reviewed the handouts with the Task Force
(see Appendix for discussion)

MOTION by Sherry Gilmore to get on log of open issues the need for a traffic analysis for area around Mount Pleasant

AMMENDED by Alan Covington to address areas around all opportunity sites
MOTION APPROVED as AMENDED

E. Topics

1. Review of log of open issues and unanswered questions posed during previous Task Force meetings and caucuses
2. Caucus report from 12.16, 1.5, and 1.12 gatherings
Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado reported on previous caucus meetings
Topics discussed: revised operating procedures, EIR constraints, and implications of development on schools
Next caucus meeting 1/26

3. Outreach update
Bonnie Moss gave an outreach update
 - a. Stakeholder meetings/gatherings will continue.
 - b. Next direct mailing. Expand the number of households that receive. Need input from Task Force through caucus setting on what matters most. Mailer to be posted on website with access to information in other languages.
 - c. Media relations, standard and ethnic. Website updates.

Task Force members asked questions and provided input on ways for handling outreach.

(see Appendix for discussion)

4. Outline Evergreen Traffic Policy (Evergreen Development Policy)
Handout: Evergreen Traffic Policy

Laurel Prevetti provided an overview of the general contents of the Evergreen Development Policy (EDP).

(see Appendix for discussion)

5. Election of developer delegation

MOTION by Ike White consideration for delegation representation should include Task Force members that live in the areas around the opportunity sites.

DISCUSSION (see Appendix for discussion)

MOTION FAILED

MOTION by Vince Songcayawon to select 7-member delegation from a list of volunteers, 5 regular members plus 2 alternate members.

AMENDED by Jim Zito and Victor Klee. Ask for volunteers, of those who volunteer task force will vote on by e-mail. Top 5 vote getters would be regular delegation members, next 2 would be alternate members.

MOTION APPROVED as AMENDED

F. New Business

Combined with agenda item G and moved to after Public Comment (see Appendix for discussion)

G. Next Agenda

Combined with agenda item F and moved to after Public Comment (see Appendix for discussion)

H. Public Comment

Two members of the public offered the following comments/questions:

Ellie Glass (Pala Rancho Neighborhood)- Ike [White] is trying to get something done. Neighborhood not well represented on the Task Force

No Name Given- Next meeting should have microphones, can't hear. Doesn't feel represented. Feels like Task Force is a little club.

I. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

MEETING APPENDIX

A. Old Business

No discussion.

B. Approve Chair/Vice-Chair for February Meeting

No discussion.

C. Approve of EVP Operating Procedures

No discussion.

D. Clarification of Key Elements of EVP Process & EIR Constraints

Laurel Prevetti highlighted the process and decision steps outlined in the EVP Process Diagram handout.

February '05- need project description in order to answer questions about/analyze transportation, schools, flooding

March '05- 1st draft strategy document, design guidelines and Evergreen Development Policy (new traffic policy that governs development in Evergreen)

April '05- well underway with environmental review, may refine project description at this point

May '05- continue working on draft strategy, financing mechanisms to make sure get community amenities and traffic improvements

July '05- Draft EIR for public review, by law City is required to respond to any comments, will review with Task Force major concerns and responses

September '05- Task Force recommendation

The solid boxes on the diagram represent “decision steps”. There are decision opportunities throughout the process to raise concerns.

The dotted boxes represent process steps and information gathering

From zonings to just before building permits there will be opportunities for community involvement, many opportunities to learn

Another piece of the process includes General Plan Amendments. The General Plan is a long-term blueprint, like where to put housing and at what density. The City Council will need to make changes to the General Plan.

There are a lot of opportunities to “massage” the project description through the process. Right now need a big enough “basket” for EIR. The EIR must evaluate alternatives that will be studied.

The process is funded by an outside source and we are obligated to try to follow schedule.

Laurel Prevetti referred to the previously distributed EIR Process handout and explained that an EIR does not have any decision-making weight.

Council member Dave Cortese, referring to the Key Elements diagram handout, asked, "What happens if one box is decided upon, what is the obligation to continue?"

Laurel Prevetti answered that the steps in the process build on one another, but are independent. It is best to build on the interrelationship between decisions. If the process is headed in the right direction then should continue.

Council member Dave Cortese asked a hypothetical question, if the December '05 products [on the Key Elements diagram] General Plan Amendments, strategy document, Evergreen Development Policy are okay, but the financing is not okay/out of sync, what happens?

Laurel Prevetti answered that if one product is out of sync that job is not done and it would be up to the Council if they want to accept part of a package and defer a part.

Council member Dave Cortese asked, how to do a General Plan Amendment that is interdependent [with other products]?

Laurel Prevetti answered that the City Council could approve General Plan Amendments, but if don't have a financing district can't build improvements. There can be built-in assurances that development can't happen without money [for transportation improvements and amenities].

Lou Kvitek asked, what happens if a current property owner sells?

Laurel Prevetti answered that the owners can sell, but any rules in place would always apply no matter who owns the property

Chair Steve Tedesco commented that the Task Force has spent a lot of time discussing various issues, but need to come to grips with a project description.

Laurel Prevetti offered that we have heard concerns and are trying to resolve those concerns, but we can't get started until have all three pieces; we need the number of housing units.

Council member Dave Cortese asked if we couldn't have alternative project descriptions.

Laurel Prevetti responded, yes. The EIR is required to look at a reduced scale alternative and one approach would be to create an alternative around consensus points.

Homing Yip asked if there was a master document to guarantee compliance.

Laurel Prevetti answered that the master document would be the Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy (as opposed to a Specific Plan). The ESGS would have to be consistent with the General Plan.

Chair Steve Tedesco suggested that the Task Force could come up with a project description at the next Task Force meeting.

Council member Dave Cortese asked why draft the project description at the next Task Force meeting and suggested that it would be better for the working group/Caucus to take up.

Ike White offered that it is important to note minority views/opinions and get input from the Mount Pleasant neighborhood.

Sherry Gilmore asked, when the Task Force first received the traffic analysis, was most of the housing on the industrial site? Was there any on Arcadia?

Laurel Prevetti answered that housing was all over all sites.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado said useful data would be how many housing units trigger the need for a school.

Chair Steve Tedesco asked if the Task Force can't come to a negotiating number with the developers, do the developer's have the legal wherewithal to go forward with project?

Laurel Prevetti answered, yes. There are prelims on file already. The piece that needs Council guidance is the update of the traffic policy. If the developers submit applications the City is required by law to respond. Regardless, community involvement will be a part of the process. It is just a matter of if the process is developer driven.

Lou Kvitek asked two questions, could the Task Force send 3 numbers (low, medium and high) for EIR project description? Is the Smart Growth Strategy proposed to be approved in March?

Laurel Prevetti answered, yes we could analyze different numbers. The Smart Growth Strategy would only be a draft in March.

Ike White commented that the preliminary traffic studies did not include certain intersections around the Pleasant Hills site.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado commented that the Task Force, in looking at a low, medium and high number, viewed the high number as a number beyond which was not acceptable, truly worst-case scenario.

Laurel Prevetti offered, if an alternative results in not being able to do 101 improvements then that alternative is not viable. Another alternative is the "no project" do-nothing alternative; what if we keep the existing General Plan.

MOTION by Sherry Gilmore to get on log of open issues the need for a traffic analysis for area around Mount Pleasant

AMMENDED by Alan Covington to address areas around all opportunity sites

DISCUSSION

Steve Tedesco asked why [evaluate traffic around opportunity sites] now without number of units.

MOTION APPROVED as AMENDED

Jim Zito suggested that if the Task Force sat down to negotiate a number before the EIR, if the number of units doesn't general enough funds the result is no project.

Laurel offered two approaches. Get the Task Force number, figure out how much money that generates and what transportation improvements and amenities could be paid for; or, the developers submit their number if the Task Force is not successful in generating a number.

Jim Zito added that a number only makes sense if there is tacit agreement on an upper number and suggested the Task Force or a small group could deliberate to get that number.

Laurel Prevetti emphasized the need to get a number to start the analysis and suggested a different approach would be to go with the developers number.

Homing Yip mentioned that he heard people saying the developers could go forward without the Task Force, but under current policy [they] can't do anything.

Chair Steve Tedesco asked, couldn't the City Council change the traffic policy.

Tian Zhang asked, what if the Task Force and developers can't reach a number, how does the disagreement get addressed?

Council member Dave Cortese responded, "It falls on me" and it's, "getting closer to this point".

Alan Covington asked, when we talk about the Task Force and developers coming to agreement on absolute, couldn't there be a range of numbers?

Laurel Prevetti replied, yes, with the maximum number being the most important for the purposes of the EIR.

Homing Yip suggested that the Task Force needs to know "ballpark" numbers for cost of building/construction to know how much could ask for and still allow developers to make a profit.

Council member Dave Cortese responded that the information that the Task Force is asking for has to be from dialogue with the developers and that it is cumbersome to ask questions one month then try to get answers the next month.

Chair Steve Tedesco suggested that the Task Force delegation may be a fact finding group.

Tian Zhang mentioned at a previous meeting the idea of developers operating with “open books” came up.

Chair Steve Tedesco said that this may be brought up with the fact finding delegation.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado offered that if a group is selected the Task Force can give them direction on questions to ask.

Chair Steve Tedesco closed stating that at this point can't rehash old issues; need to move process forward.

E. Topics

1. Review of log of open issues and unanswered questions posed during previous Task Force meetings and caucuses

Chair Steve Tedesco asked if there were any specific questions the Task Force had that were not answered.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado suggested maintaining an ongoing list of issues regardless of whether have answers, open or closed.

Council member Dave Cortese indicated the existence of an initial pending items list with answers that the Task Force should have received.

Alan Covington asked that the list be sent out again.

Lou Kvitek asked where the log of issues was maintained and if it could be made part of the minutes.

Chair Steve Tedesco noted that the log of issues was already an agenda item and the secretary would maintain the log of issues.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado suggested that the sequencing of the questions and answers was important.

2. Caucus reports

(see Minutes)

3. Outreach update

(see Minutes)

Bonnie Moss asked if there were any questions/input on ways for handling outreach.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado indicated that it seems like the brochure is promoting a particular point of view. We need to report out on what have already heard from public/community.

Alan Covington asked what mechanisms there would be for commenting on next mailer. Would there be a draft to the Task Force first, or would it be based on comments from the previous mailer.

Bonnie Moss answered that it would be a combination of things and it would be best to meet with her in a caucus setting because of the time required.

Lou Kvitek's suggestion: report back on community meetings, include a summary of meetings on agenda and schedule of upcoming meetings.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado added that we should encourage people to go to meetings.

Tian Zhang's comment was to have Task Force members review outreach materials.

Council member Dave Cortese indicated that as soon as the Task Force starts making decisions then will have something to report out.

4. Outline Evergreen Traffic Policy (Evergreen Area Development Policy)

Laurel Prevetti presented a general overview of the Evergreen Development Policy referring to the chapters listed in the handout, "Evergreen Development Policy – Proposed Contents".

Background – the why

Land Use – the amount of housing units and retail

Traffic Policy and Standards – the "nuts & bolts", a traffic policy unique to Evergreen, what needs to be in order to allow development to occur.

Transportation Improvements – all the improvements that are required

Hydrology – water and flooding have historically been part of the Evergreen Development Policy and still represent constraints to development

Community Amenities – the policy mechanism that hooks the balance together

Implementation – refers to the funding mechanism, phasing (amenities come on line and transportation improvements built when units are built)

Laurel Prevetti reiterated that the handout was just an overview of the general contents of the development policy, but until we [City] have a project description the policy can't be developed further.

Jim Zito asked, when EDP is finalized will it apply to all future development?

Laurel Prevetti responded that additional development capacity will be created for “small” properties.

Jenny Chang asked if schools should be part of the amenities list.

Laurel Prevetti answered that the Task Force agreed that schools are a basic need and a commitment has been made that the schools issue would be resolved. There may be other mechanisms for getting new schools. We need to understand how the school districts use school impact fees.

Alan Covington asked if the geographical boundaries [of the Evergreen Development Policy] were the same as Council District 8.

Laurel Prevetti responded that the boundaries of the EDP are Story Road to the north, 101 on the west, and the hills on the east.

Alan Covington asked if there was foreseeable future development just outside of [EDP] boundary

Laurel Prevetti answered the Edenvale industrial area.

Alan Covington asked about development on the hills south of Evergreen

Laurel Prevetti responded that there would be no more development as that area is outside of the Urban Growth Boundary.

Homing Yip suggested that a portion of amenity dollars should go toward schools.

Jim Zito added that land itself is the premium and asked if there is precedence to say x-number of acres needs to be set aside for schools

Laurel Prevetti responded that ESP did.

Jim Zito asked if potential sites could be identified for schools and if were possible, for example when the Mirassou site comes in to require dedication of 10-acres?

Council member Dave Cortese responded that facilities master planning is the responsibility of the school districts and that it would be nice if we could have those facilities master plans that identify future needs and general locations. Some districts have a facilities master plan that is really just a maintenance plan that doesn't address potential future development and future need. Council member Cortese suggested adding a box to the chart [Key Elements Diagram] that requires school district facilities master plans that address school needs.

Homing Yip asked about the “500 units” and where they would be located.

Laurel Prevetti answered that there are small pieces of land scattered throughout the area, we don't know when those

properties could develop or whether the number should be 200 or 500. The intent is to address potential future development with some extra number of units for flexibility since the City Council would probably not revisit the Evergreen Development Policy for a long time.

Homing Yip asked for clarification on the upper limit number and why Ike White commented that the school district(s) gave minimum numbers. 600 units [on Pleasant Hills] would trigger a school need in the Mount Pleasant district. Anything under would be an impact causing the need for reorganization. Ike White suggested inviting the superintendents back to discuss minimums/requirements.

5. Election of Developer Delegation

Chair Steve Tedesco opened this item asking if anyone had any suggestions on how to proceed.

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado suggested a ballot be sent out through the Council office, with the Council office reviewing the list of candidates. Then Task Force members would select 8 members with the top five as delegates.

Council member Dave Cortese asked, why vote, why not ask for volunteers who could go and meet with developers

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado suggested the reason for a vote was democratic impulse and added that those not wanting to participate could be removed from selection list.

Council member Dave Cortese cautioned the Task Force to abide by the dates referred to in the chart [Key Outcomes Diagram] and that this process could jeopardize that schedule.

Ike White asked the Task Force to consider a delegation that includes Task Force members that represent/live in areas around opportunity sites. (see Minutes for Motion)

Homing Yip expressed support for the motion.

Lilian Jones asked for a show of hands in support of the motion.

Chair Steve Tedesco asked members to talk to the motion.

Jim Zito asked, what qualifies a Task Force member as being from area?

Ike White answered, with respect to Mount Pleasant/Pleasant Hills, someone from that area.

Chair Steve Tedesco suggested members within 1000-feet of sites.

Vikki Lang commented that she didn't see the benefit

Lou Kvitek asked, isn't the delegation negotiating Task Force decisions with developers?

Vice-Chair Mike Alvarado offered that he was not in support of the motion, the delegation needs people that can work well together.

Chair Steve Tedesco called for a vote on the motion and the motion failed.

Vince Songcayawon proposed a motion (see Minutes)

Alan Covington asked, what if 10 people volunteer?

Dan Jacobs mentioned that some of those that could represent are not here.

(see Minutes for Amendments to motion)

Tian Zhang commented that she couldn't put some of the Task Force names with faces.

Task Force Secretary to verify Task Force roster with Council office, coordinate with Council office on job description for delegates to be sent out with call for volunteers, will conduct election from Monday at 5:00PM to Wednesday 5:00PM.

F. New Business

At the request of the Chair, items F and G were combined due to similarity.

Jim Zito noted that the VTA FEIR would be coming out soon and recommended that the Task Force should review. If the FEIR is not available there should be a report out.

Alan Covington reminded the Task Force that the discussion of amendments to the Task Force Guiding Principles has been bumped from the agenda and that it should be considered at the next caucus with follow-up at the regular Task Force meeting.

Lou Kvitek suggested school facilities master planning be added to the agenda as a regular item.

Vince Songcayawon suggested, regarding Arcadia, revisiting the issue of rental and ownership mix.

Vice Chair Mike Alvarado indicated that the rental/ownership issue would probably be dealt with under the Task Force EIR Constraints.

Khanh Nguyen suggested focusing on the preliminary project description to keep in-line with the chart (Key Elements).

G. Next Agenda

Combined with agenda item F.

H. Public Comment
(see Minutes for public comments)