

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

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #19

Date: September 22, 2004

The nineteenth meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on September 22, 2004 at August Boeger Junior High School at 6:30 PM.

Task Force Attendees: Alan Covington, Bill Kozlovsky, Chris Corpus, Dan Gould, Dan Jacobs, Garth Cummings, Elias Portales, Gordon Lund, Ike White, Khanh Nguyen, Lillian Jones, Lou Kvittek, Maria Lopez, Mike Alvarado, Paul Pereira, Sherry Gilmore, Steve Tedesco, Tom Andrade, Victor Klee, Vince Songcayawon, Vikki Lang, Homing Yip, Jenny Chang

Members of the Public: Marie Sinatra, Derek Farmker, Lee Lowrie, Paul Traynor, Ivy Sarratt, Jody Pabst, Diane & Reuben Zarate, Katja Irvin, Betty Martinez, Susan Conrow, Terry Gotcher, Bill & Carol Ashman, Norm Robbins, Toni Cook, Jeanette Newman, Mark Kolb, LoAnn Fairweather, Nancy Hopkins

Staff: Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE), Britta Buys (PBCE), Kerynn Gianotti (D8), Rabia Chaudhry (D8)

I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND UPDATE

Councilmember Cortese welcomed the group and asked them to self-introduce. He then thanked the school principal, Norm Robbins, for allowing the meeting to occur at his site and added that all of the schools have been very cooperative in accommodating our meetings. Cortese then gave a background to EVP, explaining that the Task Force began meeting in August 2003 to put together a response for what Evergreen should look like in the future. He said that he wasn't sure if the major infill properties in Evergreen as currently zoned were best for Evergreen or what residents wanted. What EVP is doing is looking at the zonings for appropriateness and determining what value lies therein for the community. For example, how do you deal with traffic needs by leveraging development? The list isn't limited to traffic and public works needs but other infrastructure that the community says it wants. The Task Force created a set of inviolable Guiding Principles for any possible future development. The list was built by consensus, not parliamentary voting. Tonight's review of the land use will be a lightning rod for feedback from the community.

Cortese continued by saying he would like to clear up some misconceptions about outreach. He reminded the group that the EIR process is vital. The Task Force needs to commit to ranges in the EIR because if the EIR is approved, it closes the door on future allocations. It will allow the EDP to be temporarily reopened and then closed. Cortese said he has no intention of repeating the EVP process again. His goal is to help the community make decisions that should hold for the next decade or so.

Laurel Prevetti asked Sherry Gillmore to give a report of the EVP presentation that occurred at her home. Gillmore said that eight to ten people from the neighborhood and the Los Madres group attended. It was more of a Q&A session and the concerns centered around needed infrastructure. Prevetti said that these initial meetings were a critical component of preliminary outreach for EVP and asked Paul Pereira to summarize what transpired at the EVP presentation to the Millbrook Neighborhood Association. Pereira said that about 30 residents were in attendance and the concerns were similar to the ones mentioned by Gillmore. There was a discussion on putting in a medical center as well as comments about the use of eminent domain in order to widen White Road. Prevetti said that the homes would not be taken forcefully. She then asked Bonnie Moss to elaborate on outreach efforts. Moss explained that Tramutola has been waiting for the consensus that was to occur tonight so mailer #2 could reflect this. Mailer #1 was introductory and we have had good returns. We are also contemplating an outreach subcommittee and Moss has had conversations with Mike Alvarado about this. Alvarado said that it is clear that the community has questions and the Task Force needs to be active in setting up the small group presentations, explaining that he and Alan Covington have been at work on this. To get community consensus, we need to use this approach. Covington said that the meetings need to be larger than 10 or 20 people. We also need to not give the impression that this is a done deal. We need to believe this is still an open process and convey that to others. Cortese said he felt the comments were excellent. District 8 will contact Task Force members about with committee might suit them. This will happen in the next two to three weeks. Dan Jacobs asked if EVP would be at Day in the Park (DIP). Prevetti responded that this was a good segue – she introduced Andrew Crabtree and John Baty. Baty will be working full time on EVP and Crabtree will supervise Baty as well as other projects in the city. Prevetti added that Britta Buys would be leaving her employment with the City of San Jose. Planning will be managing a booth at DIP. Prevetti will continue to do as many evening presentations as needed.

II. REVIEW AND DISCUSS LAND USE ALTERNATIVES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Prevetti review the guiding principles with the task force and explained they had been reformatted to serve as a check list. Mark Day will go over each land use concept and walk the Task Force through the different types of housing that could be on each site so the task force can visualize what the development could look like. The goal of this exercise is to visualize what the property could look like, determine whether the concept conforms or violates the Guiding Principles and express whether or not we like what we see (generally). Alvarado said that other points need to be incorporated into the Guiding Principles, namely, level of service. Day said that the goal for this meeting is to relieve the disconnect of the task force and the properties. Cortese added that the also, tonight's purpose was to determine what we feel is presentable to the community.

Campus Industrial

Day said that if we're creating a residential community here then it needs to feel residential and pedestrian in nature. He explained the range of housing units and densities that could be found here and said that he grappled with how to make this property connect to Evergreen Village Square. He suggested breaking off Yerba Buena Road into a central area and letting it sweep around a public amenity to calm traffic. He said that although there were only three colors depicted on the drawing, there could be various housing types. These in all would be more single family luxury homes and in the design guidelines, we can stipulate such things as cut sidewalks and alleys. Day pointed out that although

the drawing shows four acres for a little league complex, more land will ultimately be given to accommodate the real configuration. Day added the following disclaimers to this site:

1. there are utilities that might need to be displaced.
2. there are property lines here that are at issue.
3. there are water quality issues – runoff, retention/detention – that must be dealt with.

Prevetti reminded the group that the eastern edge of this property is the urban growth boundary and asked for comments from the Task Force.

Gilmore said that in the June 2004 exercise we had a choice between 1600-2100 units. The task force generally came up with 6,630 units. What are the numbers on today's maps representative of? What are the densities spreads for each site? Prevetti said that 6,780 is the upper end of all four sites. The maximum on Arcadia is 3,000 units. We need to keep these numbers flexible and not lock into a final number. Gilmore responded that a comment had come from the previous meeting to set a cap on the number of units – she wants to make sure the task force is heard. Prevetti said that we are definitely hearing an overall concern for a lower cap than 6800. For this particular drawing, that comment could be represented by saying that the task force prefers to see larger versus smaller lots. Ike White asked what the unit count was to trigger creation of a new school. Tom Andrade said he could respond only with past experience. With the ESP, 1600-1800 homes generated an elementary school or a K-8 school. Gilmore said that on the ESUHSD/City of San Jose handout, 5900 units could fill a 2500 student high school. Covington said that the range of homes being examined today is 5995-6766. Prevetti said that if this low end is too high, we need to hear this. Steve Tedesco commented that if 5900 units triggers the needs for a new school and you delete 30 acres, doesn't that development capacity become lost or does it drive development on the other three sites? Cortese cautioned the task force to not jump to conclusions. ESUHSD was asked what would happen to their capacity with development given their geographic range. They have three schools under-capacity right now. The task force did not put "new school" as a guiding principle because it is not always the right answer. At a subsequent meeting we will have the three relevant superintendents tell us their current facility planning and how it will change. They can answer for us how school impact fees will affect their planning efforts. It is conceivable that the districts can bring something to the table about which we have no knowledge at present. Andrade commented that EESD and MPESD are neighborhood school districts. At the Carolyn Clark School, another 150-200 students can be accommodated but eventually this new development will need to have an elementary school. We can say that we will eventually need a K-8 school but it doesn't have to be built right now, only to remain empty until the capacity is generated. Cortese asked Andrade to impart to the task force at the next meeting all of the relevant funding issues. He added that we know that MPESD is impacted right now. The three districts will explain to us all of their needs and resources. When task force members speak to the community about EVP, they can footnote that the schools issues is currently being vetted out.

Alvarado posed three questions not regarding school impact. He asked:

1. If there would be a difference in development timeline which will affect funding.
2. How much does each land use concept yield
3. Transit capacity impact: which arteries will be impacted?
4. What would happen if one of the four opportunity sites is dropped?

Prevetti said that with respect to the fourth question, it is our understanding that all four sites have to be in play in order to fund the 101 upgrade and amenities list. While not all four sites will develop at once, they do have to all participate.

Gilmore said she disagreed – she feels a site can be taken out of the game and EVP could go forward. Prevetti responded that the property owners have a financial arrangement amongst themselves that binds them. Cortese added that we haven't yet seen a model that shifts enough development onto three sites that still fixes highway 101 and the amenities. He invited Bo Radanovich to answer from the property owners' perspective. Radanovich said that the financing plan is complicated but the ground rule of all four properties having to participate was established because each property has its own timeline for development and each property represents different segments of the market, demographics, etc. Single-family homes versus townhomes, all have different revenues. The property owners need surety on the return of the investment they are putting in and plan to give in the future. Bill Kozlovsky said that the task force needs surety that the amenities will come. Radanovich agreed, saying that the financing plan will be strong enough to control the deliverables.

Pereira commented that he wanted to ensure that all economic backgrounds are accommodated for and asked for the price ranges of the homes that could go on the industrial property. He also said that it seems this plan assumes that public transit is limited in the area of the industrial property and asked if bike and pedestrian trails could be added. Covington asked if the desired outcome for tonight is the endorsement of this plan as something to reveal to the general public. Prevetti said the goal was to see if there was a comfort level showing these unit ranges and types of housing. Garth Cummings said that the Guiding Principles make mention of environmental considerations – wildlife corridors, encouraging rehabilitation/renovation of existing properties and the use of photo simulation and 3D imaging – this land use concept does not reflect any of this. Prevetti said that we hadn't as yet used photo simulation because it was early in the process and is expensive but we could start doing so now. Regarding environmental considerations, things like solar heating and green-building practices can be captured in the design guidelines, as well as rehabbing/renovating existing properties. Cortese commented that at an earlier meeting he had brought up the idea of capturing the EVP story via a 15-minute narrated video. Is this useful? A majority of the task force responded yes. Homing Yip expressed concern, stating that simulations can manipulate data. Cortese said the video would be a narrative, not a simulation. Yip said he is overall supports EVP but most of the comments he's heard from the community have been negative. Covington agreed, adding that if we place value on outreach then we have to do a good job and the video may enhance outreach. Jacobs added that the video could be made available by the web, too. Cortese said he would follow up on this item and get details as to cost. Elias Portales expressed concern – stating that the majority of the task force did not want a video so why pursue following up on it. Cortese asked the task force again if they felt producing a video was a good idea and a majority of the task force agreed. Lillian Jones commented that a powerpoint with animation could work as well as a preliminary output.

Covington commented that the Guiding Principles checklist is hard to utilize because the drawings are not giving a high enough level of detail to answer whether or not the principles are being met. Prevetti said it is more of a tool to get us back to the ground base. Gordon Lund said that much more detail (fire stations, post offices) is needed on the

designs. Prevetti cautioned that an increased level of detail often locks into people's minds – we do not want to risk communicating what we cannot guarantee can be delivered. Lund said that we don't have to show a definite spot for public facilities, simply indicate that they need land. Cummings said he agreed with Lund.

Arcadia

Day explained that this property has consistently been associated with 3000 units. The design meets many of the Guiding Principles – classic infill, nearby transportation, ground floor retail, mixed use, senior housing, etc. Day added that the previous task force had expressed concern about edge condition treatment and this still needs to be improved; there must be an appropriate buffer against the existing single-family homes. He invited KTG architect Manny Gonzalez to elaborate on the drawing. Gonzalez explained that different types of housing on the property. Some are starter units, with different parking requirements that will vary depending on the community. The market analysis is being done now to determine the demand for this type of unit. The park location is near the existing park with a 20,000 square foot community center, ball fields and soccer fields. Within this layout the road goes through to Capitol and there are higher densities along Capitol. There is east – west connectivity and the proposal is for approximately 1500 units on the western side and 1200-1500 units on the eastern side. Tedesco commented that he can better picture what the property would look like in terms of housing but is unsure as to traffic impact. Gonzalez said that with apartments the trip generation is likely lower. Seniors don't have high trips per day and there won't be as many school age kids. Lou Kvitek asked:

1. if the property is all rental or any for sale units
2. if the road down the middle is a two-lane or a four-lane road

Gonzalez said that the current thinking is for this to be all rentals. As for the roadway width, the city will assist in determining this but the hope is for two-lane. Prevetti said that some affordable housing would be located here due to it being in an SNI area. Lund said he appreciates the market study being conducted for the unit interest but what about the main street concept? The design shows two strip malls – can't the retail carry all the way through? Also, can apartments be added up to Quimby and add more retail at corners? Gonzalez said that retail could be added at corners and along the entire street if the market study demands it. Lund asked when the study would be ready. Prevetti responded that the city is in the process of setting up a contract for the whole EVP area. Andrade said that from a schools standpoint, there would be kids. EESD doesn't have the ability to pick this addition up right now. Already children from the Arcadia area are bussed out. Also, placing a school in/near the Reid-Hillview flight path is difficult. This property will likely generate an elementary school need, perhaps it could be tied to LeyVa Middle School and we locate playfields beneath the power lines. Yip asked several questions with respect to this proposed design:

1. What is the social impact of high density?
2. What is the environmental impact of high density?
3. Impacts to quality of life?
4. Traffic impact?
5. Economic impact?

Yip said he needed the answers to these questions in order to talk to his neighbors. He also asked how property values would be affected. Prevetti said that traffic impact was discussed earlier and the task force has data already. The EIR will look at impacts – it will be available for review hopefully next spring. As far as social impact, this goes back to the

Guiding Principles, outcome 5. The industrial property will offer market rate homes and this property addresses other market segments. Cummings asked if through the market study we would try to encourage certain businesses to come here. Prevetti said that the demographics will sell this property. Incomes in the Valley are high and there are new homes being built. There is a pent-up demand for quality retail in Evergreen. It will take a marketing effort but ultimately the demographics will make affect the outcome. White asked about the affordable units on the property – are these the same types as the ones the task force visited on the field trip, the ones that helped bring up property values? Day said that the affordable units can be done tastefully and hopefully have the same positive effect.

White commented that he is concerned about teachers having to commute to teach in schools in Evergreen because they cannot afford to live here. Dan Gould said he wanted to hear feedback from the local community on this design. Prevetti said that some local residents were present this evening and invited them to speak. Leah Lowrie asked why high end homes couldn't be placed on this property since they generate less traffic. Prevetti explained that retail was originally conceived here because it could be a destination from a transit perspective. Vikki Lang added that the retail here could include medical offices. Lowrie said that that would still bring more traffic than single family homes. Jones asked if the SNI representation had any opinions on this design. Khanh Nguyen said that at previous EVP meetings, the consensus was to go head with heavier development here because it will generate the needed community center and sports fields. He added that other NAC members were present tonight (Jose Aranda and Maria Lopez) and that this design would be brought back to the NAC for discussion. Maria Lopez asked about connections across the property. Gonzalez said that a connection would exist through the park to the lightrail. Kvitek commented that along the western edge, it seemed that two and three story complexes were looking into existing single-family homes. Gonzales said this could be fixed. Andrade asked if a school could be added as well. Jose Aranda commented that he thought some of the units on this property could be for sale; he believes the community will not be happy with 100% rental. Pereira offered that there seems to be a misconception about rental. If it is well managed, it can be very nice. Alvarado asked a series of questions about this property:

1. Where are the community gathering spots like gazebos?
2. Are there any subterranean aspects?
3. There is no variety in terrain in this drawing.
4. Where are the entertainment cafes/galleries?
5. Any opportunity to locate continuing education classes here?

Andrade offered that the continuing education classes could be located at the community center. Prevetti asked if this exercise has been useful? Should additional detail be added to the other two sites? Andrade said that if this property is supposed to be the city center then perhaps a post office or DMV could be added here. Lund asked why only rental is being considered here. Gonzalez said that he could return with more detailed answers. Cummings commented that a large rental area reminds him of the Chicago projects. Lopez added that she was envisioning something like Rivermark or Santana Row here. This current design doesn't seem attractive. Cortese said that our next meeting is on 10/27/04. He asked if this evening's process was useful for the task force – is it time to start getting input from the greater community? Lowrie said she wouldn't be happy to what is currently on the map. Cortese asked if she would be comfortable. Lowrie said yes, so long as the word "proposed" is highly visible. Kvitek said he felt there was enough info to

go out to the community. Lund said more info was needed before going out to the community. Jacobs said there was a shock about the 100% rental on arcadia and he is hoping for no similar shocks on the PHGC and EVC sites. Covington asked the task force if they would consider meeting a second time this month to finish up the work. Cortese said the District 8 Office could set this up. White commented that he is baffled by the Arcadia iteration, saying that it has gone 180 degrees from what was envisioned. Cortese said that the Arcadia discussion will be picked up at the next meeting. He offered that in the City of San Jose, there is a split of 60% home ownership to 40% rental. Evergreen is predominantly homeownership; affordable housing advocates point to us in disgust. Our limited allocations have prevented us from previously developing more affordable housing.

III. NEXT STEPS

The meeting adjourned at 9:20PM.