



**Task Force Meeting No. 37 Synopsis
April 12, 2010**

Task Force Members Present*:

Jackie Adams, Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Pat Dando, Harvey Darnell, Dave Fadness, Enrique Fernandez, Leslee Hamilton, Nancy Ianni, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Shirley Lewis, Linda LeZotte, Sam Liccardo, Pierluigi Oliverio, David Pandori, Dick Santos, Patricia Sausedo, Erik Schoennauer, Jim Zito.

Task Force Members Absent:

Pastor Oscar Dace, Brian Darrow, Sam Ho, Matt Kamkar, Judy Stabile, Neil Struthers, Alofa Talivaa, Michael Van Every.

City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present*

Peter Hamilton (D9 Council Office), Matt Krupp (ESD), Ron Eddow (Housing), Wayne Chen (Housing), Vera Todorov (City Attorney), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), Jenny Nusbaum (PBCE), Jodie Clark (PBCE), Lee Butler (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE), Michael Brilliot (PBCE).

Public Present*:

Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Larry Ames, Mauricio Astacio (Neighborhoods Commission), Leah Toeniskoetter, Trixie Johnson, Virginia Holtz, David Marsland (Sierra Club), Bonnie Mace (District 8 CRT), Susan Marsland (District 4, SJSU MPA student), Richard Zappelli (WGNA), Jack Nadeau (Greater Palm Haven Neighborhood Association), Richard Silva, Vince Cantore (Summerhill Homes)

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

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at 6:37 p.m.

2. Review and approval of March 22, 2010 synopsis

The synopsis was approved.

3. Review and Discuss Work Program & Task Force Meeting Schedule

Laurel Prevetti highlighted future items and dates on the Task Force's Work Program. Ms. Prevetti announced the May 15, 2010 Community Land Use Workshop and noted that the staff report for the April 20th City Council consideration of a Preferred Land Use Scenario is available online. A Task Force member indicated that the tentatively scheduled June 14th Task Force meeting may conflict with a City Council budget hearing. Staff indicated they would follow-up and relay any meeting cancellations or new dates to the Task Force members.

4. March 22, 2010 Task Force Meeting – Review Task Force Recommendation

Laurel Prevetti reminded the Task Force of the progress they have made to date, highlighted the five main recommendations the Task Force made at their 3/22 meeting, and explained how changes resulting from the Task Force recommendations were displayed on the Preferred Land Use Scenario Growth Capacity Table.

5. Growth Phasing/Timing Concepts

Laurel Prevetti made a brief presentation on the staff proposed growth phasing/timing concepts and provided further detail on the implementation of the Growth Area strategy, which directs most new growth to specific identified areas while limiting growth in other areas of the City. Ms. Prevetti highlighted the legal and policy framework that the growth phasing/timing concepts would need to meet, and explained proposed concepts such as the division of the Plan timeframe into four timed Horizons, each with a City Council check-in, changing the Land Use Diagram with each Horizon so that the availability of housing growth capacity can be gradual, directed first to higher priority growth areas, coordinated with infrastructure planning, and implemented following the preparation of a Village plan for the growth area. Ms. Prevetti explained that job growth capacity would not be phased and would be available throughout the life of the plan. She explained the “Proposed Housing Growth by Horizon” maps and the accompanying table, noting specific areas that would have housing growth capacity in each year, and indicating that upcoming Task Force discussion of the Land Use/Transportation Diagram would further inform the phasing plan.

The Task Force met in small groups at five tables to discuss the proposed phasing/timing concepts. At the conclusion of the small group discussion, each Task Force member provided a brief statement. Some Task Force members expressed support for the geographic based phasing plan and/or other elements of staff’s recommendations while others expressed frustration that housing growth could not be more directly linked to job growth. Task Force members asked if staff could further investigate legal options available to ensure that housing growth did not outpace job growth.

Task Force members spoke of the need for the General Plan to clearly identify the specific development potential for each Growth Area. Other Task Force members spoke of the need for each phase to consider availability of infrastructure and City services such as parks, schools, community centers and pools when determining whether to open additional housing capacity. Task Force members noted that maintenance of economic and fiscal stability, infrastructure, and levels of service would need to be evaluated as housing capacity is expanded. Task Force members noted that they wanted to ensure that transportation funding and the availability of infrastructure coincided with growth.

Task Force members expressed support for regular check-ins with the community and City Council to identify whether implementation of the plan is consistent with the vision for the plan and to direct adjustments as necessary. Some Task Force members suggested that check-ins are needed more frequently than the seven to eight year time frames of the proposed horizons, and one Task Force member expanded on this, asking whether specified time frames are needed for each Horizon. Some Task Force members stated that the housing growth capacity allocated to the first Horizon was too high.

With respect to specific geographic locations, one Task Force member requested clarification on how the indicated housing growth capacity for the Evergreen area Villages aligned with the Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy. One Task Force member indicated that the Stevens Creek Corridor Growth Area should not prompt the displacement of the existing auto dealerships. Task Force members suggested that North 1st Street housing growth be included in Horizon 1.

6. Public Comment

Community members participated in the small group discussion of the phasing/timing concepts at two facilitated public tables. Following the Task Force member reports, staff summarized the discussion from the community table groups.

Community Table 1, facilitated by Jenny Nusbaum, concurred with many of the themes noted by the Task Force. Stated objectives included a desire for a better balance between job and housing growth, tying housing capacity to transportation improvements, and use of clearer language and fewer acronyms in staff prepared materials. Related to specific geographic locations, the table participants questioned why Oakridge Mall and V70 at Camden and Wooster would not be available for mixed-use development sooner.

Community Table 2, facilitated by Susan Walsh, concurred with many of the Task Force member comments and generally supported staff's recommendation. They asked how development would be approached when no Village Plan is in place and whether current and original assumptions would still be valid at the proposed Council and neighborhood check-ins. Participants supported the expanded use of evaluation criteria before future Horizons open additional housing capacity and expressed support for directing jobs growth away from Greenfield areas.

In addition to the facilitators' public table report outs, three members of the public spoke separately, commenting that: Brownfield growth should be prioritized over Greenfields growth, Grand Boulevards needed to be called out more clearly in maps, walkable/bikable communities are very important, maps need to show parks, mixed-use should be supported in as many areas as possible (and sooner rather than later, not waiting on transit to arrive), and that the phasing should be better aligned with the construction or availability of existing infrastructure, including transit.

7. Task Force Recommendation on General Plan Phasing

The group discussion began with a motion that the Task Force recommend to the City Council that growth in the new General Plan be phased, using concepts as recommended by staff, with an emphasis on the need for mid-course reviews and discussions between staff, the community, and the City Council. Staff clarified that the phasing plan will continue to be discussed by the Task Force, particularly as the Task Force considers the implementation section of the Envision plan. Staff further clarified that the motion would mean that the Task Force is supporting the idea that the General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram change over time with Horizons potentially opening at different time periods with embedded evaluation criteria for each Horizon, that growth be closely tied to the availability of infrastructure, that Village Plans be prepared in advance of new housing construction within any Village area, and that housing growth be strictly limited outside of Growth Areas. A Task Force member asked if job/employment ratios or some other economic or fiscal determinant could be used to meter growth in stead of year-based time periods, and a revised motion was accepted that indicated clearly measurable goals and outcomes would need to be met

in order to determine when it would be acceptable to move into a later horizon, thus opening additional housing locations and capacity. The revised motion passed unanimously.

8. Announcements

The Task Force was reminded of the pending meeting dates discussed under Agenda Item 3. Co-chair Shirley Lewis recommended that Task Force members review the City of Santa Clara's General Plan Update Chapter 5 Goals and Policies, particularly the section on phasing.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:29 p.m.