



**Task Force Meeting No. 33 Synopsis  
February 8, 2010**

**Task Force Members Present\*:**

Jackie Adams, Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Pastor Oscar Dace, Brian Darrow, Dave Fadness, Harvey Darnell, Enrique Fernandez, Leslee Hamilton, Sam Ho, Nancy Ianni, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Shirley Lewis, Linda LeZotte, Sam Liccardo, Pierluigi Oliverio, David Pandori, Dick Santos, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Neil Struthers, Alofa Talivaa, Michael Van Every, Jim Zito.

**Task Force Members Absent:**

Pat Dando, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Matt Kamkar, Patricia Sausedo.

**City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present\***

Ru Weerakoon (Mayor's Office), Roma Dawson (D3 Council Office), Peter Hamilton (D9 Council Office), Wayne Chen (Housing), Hans Larsen (DOT), Manuel Pineda (DOT), Paul Ma (DOT), Joseph Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Susan Walton (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), Lee Butler (PBCE).

**Public Present\*:**

Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Virginia Holtz (LWV/SJ-SC), Trixie Johnson (LWV/SJ-SC), Larry Ames, Carlos Babcock (Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition), David Marsland (Sierra Club Cool Cities), Pat Reardon (LMV), Stephen Gifford, Chris Franchuk (Sierra Club Cool Cities), Fran Stewart (Sierra Club Cool Cities), Tom Armstrong (HMH Engineers), Susan Marsland (District 1 resident & SJSU Graduate Student), Kathryn Mathewson (District 6 resident), Nicole Smith (Sierra Club), Liz Frank, Sohrab Rashid (Fehr & Peers), Matt Haynes (Fehr & Peers).

\*As verified by registering attendance on Sign-In Sheets.

**1. Welcome**

The meeting convened at 6:32 p.m.

**2. Review and approval of January 25, 2010 synopsis**

The synopsis was approved.

**3. Goals, Policies, and Implementation Actions – Consent Items**

a. *Safety and Hazards*

Task Force members requested clarification on what “neighboring uses” are, expressed an opinion that building setbacks due to potential vibration can waste valuable land close to transit, and noted a need to expand language about sea level rise. In response to a question from the Task Force, staff indicated that Airport Operations Goals and Policies would be developed after input from the full City Council. Task Force members expressed support for policies addressing noise from cars and other uses, and a Task Force member noted that the City should work with State and regional agencies to promote Safety and Hazards

policies that support intensification of existing urban areas, particularly near transit and consistent with other Envision goals.

b. *Economic Development*

Task Force member Brian Darrow briefly presented a revised proposal to add an additional Goal and related policies supporting middle class economic prosperity and opportunity. Several Task Force members expressed support for the concepts expressed in this Goal, and the Task Force requested that staff review the proposal and incorporate the concept into a revised version of the complete Economic Development policies for the Task Force to consider at a future date.

Staff clarified information related to clean technology, and Task Force members commented on the need for additional language related to small business development and the need to address information technology infrastructure. Other Task Force members suggested minor edits to various policies and requested performance measures for select draft policies.

A Task Force member expressed a desire to revisit the conversation on the direction of the General Plan Update with regards to how general or specific the goals, policies, and implementation actions should be.

c. *Housing and Residential Land Use*

One Task Force member requested additional references to urban design and parks in the Housing policy text. Another Task Force member lamented that parking language in a draft policy addressing bed and breakfast inns could discourage historic preservation efforts and requested the policy be revised. In response to a question on development potential outside of the Urban Growth Boundary, staff noted the potential “takings” issue, and agreed to consult further with the City attorney. A Task Force member requested clarification on the definition of “walking distance” in one of the goals, and various other minor edits to the goals and policies were suggested by Task Force members.

#### **4. Aligning Jobs, Housing, and Transportation with our Vision**

Andrew Crabtree and Hans Larsen gave an introductory presentation that outlined mode-shift goals, policies necessary to achieve those mode shift goals, and some key results from analysis of transportation changes across the land use study scenarios. In response to Task Force questions, staff clarified various mode-shift policies and noted that transportation analysis results are for full build-out of the scenarios, including transit ridership for future BART stations. Staff also suggested that the analyses based on the full capacity of each scenario could be considered as a tool to identify a desired end point for a desired growth trajectory that could be followed by the City, since full build-out will likely not occur within the life of the plan.

Several Task Force members expressed the desire to include more incentives for moving away from single-occupant vehicles, stating that the proposed mode-shift policies were primarily deterrents to solo driving. Responding to Task Force concerns that funding changes are needed to make transit viable in the long term, staff noted that the revenues gained from increasing the cost of driving in the various mode-shift policies would help fund transit.

Various Task Force members provided their own reasoning for why they would support one mode-share goal or another. Task Force members offered statements ranging from a desire to set lower, conservative, or realistic targets; the belief that the 40% VMT reduction is realistic and that free parking impairs our ability to reduce VMT; questions of how the Task Force will defend progressive transit policies in an auto-centric community, how the policies would impact residents' quality of life, and how regional policies would be implemented uniformly; the thought that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission may have a lower VMT reduction goal that is closer to 10%; and suggestions that more scenario analysis is needed before the mode-share policies could be selected. A Task Force member suggested that an incremental approach may be better suited to pursue the more aggressive VMT reduction targets.

## **5. Public Comment**

Eleven members of the public commented on the topics discussed by the Task Force, indicating support for: the 40% VMT reduction target, stating that it is a realistic target and that policies should be implemented in an equitable manner; improved walkability; historic preservation; parks; connections between uses; reduced parking requirements and alternative parking arrangements; noise reduction; compliance with AB32 and SB375; and taxes on vehicular use that go to support transit improvements. One speaker noted that single-occupant vehicular travel is currently incentivized, and other speakers agreed, noting that deterrents against single-occupant vehicles are warranted. Two speakers argued that aggressive VMT-reduction policies would not put San Jose at a competitive advantage in attracting businesses.

## **6. Task Force Recommendation (vote on motions as needed)**

A Task Force member asked for a recap of how the Envision process supports and fits under SB375 and AB32, and staff responded that San Jose is striving to achieve a single sustainable community strategy for the entire region and that the Envision work thus far serves as a model for other cities. The Task Force made no formal motions.

## **7. Announcements**

Michael Van Every announced the community meeting for the Ohlone development proposal at W. San Carlos and Sunol Streets.

Andrew Crabtree announced the availability of the Wikiplanning report and referred the Task Force to other announcements posted on the Envision website.

## **8. Adjourn**

A Task Force member provided a closing remark, encouraging the group to think about what they would like the City to be like when considering goals, suggesting that opportunities are more readily recognized if a goal is in place.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.