



**Task Force Meeting No. 35 Synopsis
March 8, 2010**

Task Force Members Present*:

Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Harvey Darnell, Brian Darrow, Dave Fadness, Leslee Hamilton, Sam Ho, Nancy Ianni, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Shirley Lewis, Linda LeZotte, Sam Liccardo, Pierluigi Oliverio, David Pandori, Patricia Sausedo, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Alofa Talivaa, Michael Van Every, Jim Zito.

Task Force Members Absent:

Jackie Adams, Pastor Oscar Dace, Pat Dando, Enrique Fernandez, Matt Kamkar, Dick Santos, Neil Struthers.

City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present*

Roma Dawson (D3 Council Office), Peter Hamilton (D9 Council Office), Ru Weerakoon (Mayor's Office), Manuel Pineda (DoT), Ron Eddow (Housing), Joseph Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Susan Walton (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), Jenny Nusbaum (PBCE), Jodie Clark (PBCE), Lee Butler (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE).

Public Present*:

Virginia Holz, Kerri Hamilton, Walter Soellner (Art Commission), Jack Wimberly, Jack Nadeau, Vince Cantore (Summerhill Homes), Tom Armstrong (HMH), Justin Fried (ABAG), Trixie Johnson (LWV/SJ-SC), Helen Chapman (SHPNA), Dan Chapman (SHPNA), Anil Babbar (SCCAOR), Keith Davis (Health Trust), David Marsland (Sierra Club, SJ Coolcities), Susan Marsland (District 1), Mauricio Astacio (Neighborhoods Commission).

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

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at 6:34 p.m.

2. Review and approval of February 22, 2010 synopsis

The synopsis was approved.

3. Recommendations

Co-Chair Shirley Lewis welcomed the group with an introductory statement, asking that the Task Force consider what is best for the entire San Jose community, and not necessarily what appears best for an individual's specific interest.

Joe Horwedel provided a synopsis of the community input that had been received through the February 27th Community Workshop and through the online Survey Monkey questionnaire, noting that top priorities identified by the community were economic development, fiscal stability, minimizing environmental impacts, and increasing transit ridership. Mr. Horwedel outlined the housing and employment growth capacity contained in the San Jose 2020 General Plan, and then described staff's recommended Preferred Land Use Study Scenario (Scenario 6), and the proposed phasing associated with the recommendation.

A Task Force member responded to staff's recommendation by indicating support for fewer housing units than the number contained in Scenario 6. Another Task Force member referred to the addendum to the Applied Development Economic Fiscal Report, and Mr. Horwedel indicated that the environmental and fiscal impacts of Scenario 6 would be anticipated to be similar to those from Scenarios 1, 4, and 5. Instructions were provided for the small group discussions, and it was noted that while comments were welcome on phasing issues, the Task Force should be focused on the selection of a Preferred Land Use Study Scenario that identifies total job and housing growth capacities to prepare for a vote at the end of the evening.

4. Envision Land Use Study Scenarios (Task Force Small Group Discussion)

The Task Force members, seated at five separate tables in groups of five to six individuals, discussed staff's recommendation (including the phasing contained therein), alternatives to staff's recommendation, and then each member provided his or her own thoughts and recommendations. Community members either participated in their own small group discussions, or observed the Task Force member groups.

5. Full Task Force (Facilitated) Discussion

At the conclusion of the small-group discussion, the full Task Force and the community heard each Task Force member briefly outline his or her recommendation for a Preferred Land Use Scenario, with some Task Force members also explaining the reasoning behind their recommendation. During the report from the second Task Force table, a different scenario was described with relatively high job growth but more limited housing capacity, and called Scenario 7. The following table identifies the job and housing growth capacity in all scenarios, including staff-recommended Scenario 6, and Scenario 7, and also summarizes the preferences expressed by Task Force members during individual reports:

Table: Number of Task Force Members who identified each Scenario as their first choice

Scenario	Jobs/Employed Resident	Job Growth Capacity	Housing Growth Capacity	Task Force Members Supporting Scenario
1	1.2	255,550	88,650	1
2	1.1	346,550	135,650	4
3	1.0	339,530	158,970	1
4	1.5	526,050	88,650	5
5	1.2	431,550	135,650	9
6	1.3	470,000	120,000	10
7	1.3	410,000	90,000	5

Task Force comments during individual reports included: broad support for high job capacity; questions regarding how job losses and gains would be quantified; a desire to ensure mass transit expansion keeps up with new growth; concern that proposed housing capacity would far exceed our historic housing growth rates; a desire to attract new jobs; support for preservation of employment lands as such; thoughts that the job capacity in the high jobs scenarios is unrealistic, and that the high housing numbers are unrealistic, suggesting that the Task Force should send a message to nearby cities by choosing a high job capacity and lower housing capacity; the desire to create new villages; the desire for additional steps or phases for monitoring growth capacity

contained within the San Jose 2020 General Plan; the desire to strive for high job growth and to attract businesses; a comment that San Jose currently ranks last in the ratio of current jobs to employed residents, compared to other large cities greater than 500,000 in population; the need for environmental, fiscal, and economic stability; the need for housing capacity and growth as a means to help keep housing prices affordable; a reference to the current, extensive vacancies in employment lands; the need for schools to be improved; support for enhanced and expanded public transit; a statement that all Study Scenarios preserve employment lands; a reference to the ADE fiscal report which stated that housing can be a positive fiscal benefit for the City if retail is captured; support for regular scheduled check-ins with the City Council to evaluate the progress of the Envision General Plan in achieving its main goals and objectives; and support for a fiscally strong Preferred Land Use Scenario.

6. Public Comment

Eleven members of the public spoke. Comments included the following: development should integrate uses and be transit, pedestrian, and biking friendly; population stabilization is needed, which would result in the need to plan for fewer people; jobs, equity, affordable housing, and density (especially near transit, including bus rapid transit) are needed to improve quality of life in San Jose; good school districts and transit in proximity to schools is needed; incentives for economic development are needed; land use scenarios need to be phased; plan for jobs near transit; provide an identity to put San Jose on the map; ABAG projections provide too much housing capacity; the kind and quality of jobs is important; high density development is needed for housing and jobs; and concern that villages without housing could limit a sense of community.

Of the speakers who indicated their preferred Land Use Study Scenario, three chose Scenario 7, two chose Scenario 4, and one each chose Scenarios 3, 5, and 6. Another speaker preferred either Scenario 5 or 6, and a final speaker preferred a variation of Scenario 5 with additional, phased housing.

7. Task Force Vote on Recommendation for a Preferred Land Use Scenario

First Motion: A Task Force member made a motion for the Task Force to recommend Scenario 7 as the Preferred Land Use Study Scenario, with a modification that would require phasing within the 60,000+ housing unit capacity contained by the San Jose 2020 General Plan; a first phase would contain about 30,000 housing units.

Many Task Force members spoke in opposition to the motion. A Task Force member cited the ABAG projections that identify a housing demand well above the 90,000 unit capacity proposed in the motion for Scenario 7. Some Task Force members said that housing may not happen in other cities; that a lack of affordable housing could restrict job growth; that transit-oriented, walkable villages would not occur with capacity for only 90,000 dwelling units; that villages would internally phase themselves, so overall village phasing would not be necessary; and that housing production creates jobs. Another Task Force member stated that the City's average dwelling unit production rate of approximately 3,000 units per year might not be relevant because of changes occurring in the housing industry, and stated that housing production would link to job production. Another Task Force member expressed concern that the children and grandchildren of Task Force members would not be able to live in San Jose in the future if the planned residential capacity was only 90,000 dwelling units. Other Task Force members stated that the motion would result in an

jobs to employed resident ratio that was out of balance, and would exacerbate an existing regional imbalance.

Other Task Force members were more supportive of the motion. Task Force members stated that providing services to residents of new housing costs the City more than providing for jobs (due to police, fire, parks, etc.); that 3,000 dwelling units per year is a fast housing production pace; that the City will not reach a 1.3 jobs to employed resident ratio; and that extensive housing production would prevent the City from reaching an improved jobs to employed resident ratio compared to the current ratio of about 0.8. A Task Force member noted that the City Council, not ABAG, sets the course for the City, and another Task Force member supported this comment by noting that ABAG looks to the City's policies when the staff develop their projections.

Second Motion: A substitute motion for the Task Force to recommend Scenario 6 was made. After a brief discussion, the maker of the new motion agreed with the maker of the original motion to move that the Task Force recommend Scenario 6 with a modification to add phasing within the existing 60,000+ housing unit capacity of the San Jose 2020 General Plan; a first phase would be around the 30,000 housing unit mark.

A Task Force member commented that when San Jose builds housing, other cities build jobs, and that the City needs to attract jobs back to San Jose, adding that a 1:1 jobs to employed resident ratio would continue our current job deficit. Another Task Force member stated that since most of the Task Force members indicated support for Scenarios 6 and 7, staff should bring additional analysis of those scenarios to the next meeting, and stated that the two scenarios should include a new step/phase within the existing San Jose 2020 General Plan capacity.

The Task Force then voted on the motion on the floor to recommend Scenario 6, the staff recommendation, with an additional step/phase within the existing General Plan capacity. The motion carried, with 14 Task Force members in support and 11 in opposition, with several members not voting.

Laurel Prevetti indicated that staff would bring additional information to the next Task Force meeting to assist the Task Force in its discussions and recommendations on the timing and location of both housing and job growth within the Task Force-recommended Scenario, as this information is critical to beginning the environmental review process for the General Plan Update. A Task Force member commented that some differences in opinion, especially amongst those initially favoring Scenarios 6 and 7, could be worked out through an appropriate phasing plan. One Task Force member noted that more flexibility in the locations of housing would be needed.

8. Announcements

The Task Force was reminded about the need for each Task Force member to sign and return to staff a copy of the City's Code of Ethics form.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.