

M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #16

Date: June 23, 2004

The sixteenth meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on June 23, 2004 at Evergreen Valley High School at 6:30 PM.

Task Force Attendees: Councilmember Dave Cortese, Alan Covington (charrette), Bill Kozlovsky (Quimby Creek), Daniel Gould (SCVCC), Daniel Jacobs (Meadowlands), Gordon Lund (Groesbeck), Homing Yip (EHRAG), Ike White (Pleasant Hills), Jim Zito (Quimby Creek – alternate, charrette), Jose Arranda (Meadowfair NA – alternate), Khanh Nguyen (West Evergreen SNI, charrette), Lillian Jones (charrette), Lou Kvitek (SCVCO)-, Mark Milioto (Evergreen Little League), Mike Alvarado (charrette), Paul Pereira (Millbrook NA), Scott Nickle (charrette), Sherry Gillmore (charrette, Holly Oak), Steve Tedesco (charrette, Boys & Girls Club), Tian Zhang (Madison Neighbors), Tom Andrade (charrette, EESD Superintendent), Victor Klee, Vikki Lang (Evergreen Little League – alternate), Vince Soncayawon (EBPA, charrette)

Members of the Public: Alan Chin, Suketu Parikh, Maria Sinatra, Jack Williams, Hong Dao Nguyen, Tony Seebach, Kevin Ho, Mary Kolb, Frank Jung, Joe Shyy, Ivy Serratt, Ursula Iyer, Glen Qin

Development Community: Rich Lambie, Mike Keaney, Bonnie Moss, Gerry De Young, Patrick Spillane, Gretchen Sauer, Tom Armstrong, Joe Sordi, Bo Radanovich

Staff: Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Kerynn Gianotti (D8), Britta Buys (PBCE), Rabia Chaudhry (D8), Julie Render (VTA), Hans Larsen (DOT), Ray Salvano (DOT), Dave Mitchell (PRNS)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Councilmember Cortese welcomed everyone and gave a brief overview of EVP as there were new faces in the room. He explained that several hundred acres of vacant land in Evergreen were under consideration for development so long as the appropriate transportation and community infrastructure could be financed and put in place. The task force has been meeting over the last ten months and soon the proposed development plans will go out to the neighborhoods for their input. Cortese added that the task force would not meet in July. Instead, staff will work with whatever plans are developed today and come back to the group in August.

II. PREPARE COMMENT LETTER DEIR FOR DTEV CAPITAL EXPY CORRIDOR

DOT Deputy Director Hans Larsen briefly reviewed the highlights of the DEIR for the downtown east valley lightrail project and explained that this is an effort to create a complete multimodal transportation system that is attractive and a part of the community. Santa Clara County voters approved the funding of this project as part of Measure A. The DEIR does take into account future development in the area so EVP is a consideration.

PBCE Deputy Director Laurel Prevetti explained that Evergreen resident Jim Zito has written to VTA regarding the DEIR and that by law VTA must respond to every point in the letter. She asked the task force if they would like to submit comments as well. Task force member Lou Kvitek asked if the removal of a lane along Capitol Expressway is something the City controls. Larsen responded that the City is a partner in this project and from the City's perspective, the lane could be lost. In fact, the HOV lane was never intended to remain permanent. Task force member Bill Kozlovsky said that he and Jim Zito measured the lane along Capitol Expressway and they feel there isn't a need to remove them. Larsen explained that removing the lanes would allow space for the creation of other things such as a sidewalk and visual amenities. Kozlovsky said he felt retaining the lanes was worth more than the amenities. Task force member Victor Klee asked what the status was of the connection to the downtown line. Larsen said that the DEIR would be released later this year. Task force member Steve Tedesco asked if it was possible to come to agreement this evening on this matter. Cortese said that task force members can contact VTA directly but whatever comments have been expressed today will be collected and forwarded to VTA. Cortese asked if any task force member did not want the HOV lane loss issue mentioned in the letter and the majority did not raise their hands. Task force member Sherry Gillmore asked if any task force member had contacted Planning and/or the D8 Council Office with comments since the last task force meeting besides herself and the answer at that point was no. Task force member Dan Gould asked if more information could be made available on the baseline alternative to the lightrail. VTA representative Julie Render said the alternative is to improve bus service. Gould said he's not sure as to the benefits of lightrail without thoroughly reviewing the DEIR. Render said that when initial exploratory work was done for this project, staff received a great deal of positive feedback on lightrail over bus service. People also commented that they'd like to see Capitol Expressway more aesthetically pleasing. That is why the right of way is being taken, to add a 10-foot multiuse path. The VTA Board has also adopted this project as a priority. Task force member Mike Alvarado asked if Zito's letter captures the HOV vs. amenity issue. Cortese asked the task force to contact Prevetti if they endorse Zito's letter. Meanwhile, Prevetti will draft a separate letter from the task force to VTA to address the HOV v. amenity issue. Prevetti said she must have all comments by 6/27/04. Task force member Homing Yip asked the group to consider such questions as: what is the maximum capacity of lightrail and its effects on local traffic? What are the current and projected ridership numbers?

III. GROUP EXERCISE

Prevetti explained that each task force member has been given a packet of information to be used in the group exercise. The goal of the exercise is to balance new development on all opportunity sites and its traffic impacts with the desired community amenities and transportation improvements, using the Guiding Principles. The task force was randomly divided into four groups and each asked to select land use alternatives for all opportunity sites (or create their own), determine the total benefit contribution of the chosen land use alternatives for all opportunity sites, subtract assumed base transportation improvements (\$104 million) to calculate available funding for other transportation improvements and community amenities, and identify the transportation and community amenities that can be funded with the remaining available funding. Each group assigned a recorder who would report-out on the group's decisions. Task force member Mark Milioto asked about the two sports complexes listed on the amenities list. Cortese said that one on the Arcadia property is for drop-in games and the other is for little league. Kvitek asked if plans to

address the overcrowded schools issue should be considered an amenity since statutory impact fees (generated by housing development) aren't enough. Cortese said that the school district is a distinct governing body. In terms of each group's plan, they can place whatever conditions they like. The district does have access to school and bond money as well as the statutory fees to fund their operations.

IV. GROUP PRESENTATION

The task force had been divided into the following groups:

Group A – Jose, Alan, Lou, Victor, Bill, Tom

Group B – Vince, Lillian, Paul, Scott, Gordon

Group C - Dan J., Mark, Ike, Tian, Khanh

Group D - Homing, Dan G., Sherry, Steve, Mike

The following information was presented by each group:

- Group Exercise Summary
- Land Use Summary
- Group A Summary
- Group B Summary
- Group C Summary
- Group D Summary
- Transportation Improvements Summary
- Community Amenities Summary

Prevetti said that these options would be reviewed over July. To summarize, we heard comments on a main street concept for the Arcadia property but acknowledging the possible addition of retail to the college property. On the campus industrial sites there was an interest in lower density (with a concern that a 4,000 square foot lot is being considered large). On the Pleasant Hills site there was a plan that located retail/office here. Cortese said that staff will come back in August with more detailed plans, consistent with the commonalities of what has been presented here today. The groups can resume deliberations in order to deal with areas of dissent. The plans can also be run through the traffic models to see what they generate.

V. NEXT STEPS

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM.