



## **Task Force Meeting Synopsis May 27, 2008**

### **Task Force Members Present\*:**

Co-Chair Shirley Lewis, Co-Chair Sam Liccardo, Vice Chair David Pandori, Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Frank Chavez, Judy Chirco, Yolanda Cruz, Harvey Darnell, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Dave Fadness, Enrique Fernandez, Leslee Hamilton, Sam Ho, Dan Hoang, Nancy Ianni, Lisa Jensen, Matt Kamkar, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Linda LeZotte, Pierluigi Oliverio, Jenniffer Rodriguez, Dick Santos, Patricia Sausedo, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Michael Van Every.

### **Task Force Members Absent:**

Pastor Oscar Dace, Pat Dando, Jackie Adams, Gary Chronert, Frank Jesse, Neil Struthers, Alofa Talivaa, and Jim Zito.

### **City Staff and Other Public Agencies Present\*:**

Ru Weerakoon (Mayor's office), Roma Dawson (Councilmember Liccardo's office), Peter Hamilton (Councilmember Chirco's office), Matt Krupp (ESD), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Latha Seshadri (PRNS), Joseph Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Stan Ketchum (PBCE), Michael Brilliot (PBCE), Hadasa Lev (PBCE), and Stefanie Hom (PBCE).

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

### **1. Welcome and Review of Agenda**

The meeting was convened at approximately 6:30 p.m.

### **2. Review and Approval of Synopsis of the April 28, 2008 Meeting**

The following correction was requested:

- On the first page Task Force member Harvey Darnell should be taken off the list of Task Force Members Present and remain on the list of Task Force Members Absent.

The synopsis, as revised, was approved.

### **3. Begin to develop Land Use Alternatives – Michael Brilliot, Senior Planner with the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement.**

The Task Force provided the following comments:

- It was very helpful to get materials in advance of the meeting. Request was made that this be done for future meetings.

**a. Introduction of Envision San Jose 2040 Employment and Population Trends and Projections - Stephen Levy, Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy.**

**b. Task Force Discussion – The following questions were asked of the Task Force:**

**I. Does the Task Force have questions on the methodology, assumptions and/or the implications of these projections?**

The Task Force provided the following comments:

- The biggest struggle in this General Plan will be to achieve a jobs-housing balance and ensure that the City has the ability to provide services in the future.
- Need to look at more diverse housing types. This is a compelling argument for intensification in dynamic urban areas.
- ABAG is talking about population and job growth and MTC is indicating the City will be financially limited in terms of infrastructure to support that growth. It appears that these agencies are not coordinating. It is vital that we consider the sustainability of our fiscal and economic base. It is our job to address the need of existing and future residence for a quality place to live.
- Concerned that this City's driving industries are information and service based - industries that do not pay taxes to the City.
- While the service sector is the fastest growing job sector, these jobs typically have low pay.
- Should develop a strategy for how to deal with the service sector as a huge industry.
- In the presentation, the Bay Area job growth was shown in thousands per year. Request was made to provide the same information in percentages.
- The reduction in job growth and the need to absorb the population growth is troubling from the fiscal standpoint of the city.
- Need to fix our structural deficit and our jobs/housing imbalance in order to handle the future.
- Concerned about the jobs-housing imbalance and the financial challenges that both young workers and retired people will be facing. If we cannot bring services closer to the housing, will people stay here or move?

**II. Does the Task Force accept the population and employment projections as the basis for the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update?**

**Yes: 25**

**No: 2**

**Need more information: 2**

**Task Force members who responded “yes” provided the following comments:**

- Request was made for more information on the issue of the job growth slowing down after 2017.
- The mega trends are correct but it was opined that the jobs and population growth would be a bit lower than the projection based on personal experience.
- The numbers are optimistic and we should use optimistic projections as a basis for determining sustainability.
- Concerns regarding geographical areas.
- Request was made for data that disaggregated job growth by income levels.
- Yes on housing projections. Suggestion was made that the Task Force not accept the job growth projections and try to figure out a way to increase this job growth. Need to identify what the City has done in the past to impede job growth and impede the development of services close to housing. We should undue the jobs-housing imbalance.
- Growth is inevitable but we can influence how we grow. Need more understanding regarding future

trends and types of future jobs. In the future people may not require the same type of office space as they do today. We should be doing everything we can to increase that job base.

- It is dangerous to look at serving the future population the same way we have been. The needs of various demographic groups differ and therefore services for each group will differ. We also need to look at how we deliver these services.
- The assumption that we need more jobs than housing may not be valid because it is based on the way governments are currently funded. The way city governments are currently funded does not work and it is possible that how cities are funded will change in the future.
- This General Plan will need to include a process where the City periodically reviews the Plan's assumptions, identifying whether they are still valid, and whether the Plan is moving us towards our goals.

**Task Force members who responded “no” provided the following comments:**

- Concern was raised regarding the service industry and the quality of the jobs being created. Request was made for more information on this issue.
- This city is dealing with a severe structural problem. We should not stand behind a plan that will make the situation worse.

**Task Force members who responded “I don't know, I need more information” provided the following comments:**

- Request for more information on population trends and what the current housing stock looks like.
- Request that staff be more responsive to Task Force members' request for more information. Information for ABAG projection accuracy was requested in the past.

III. Based on the information you have thus far, should the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan accommodate these employment and population projections?

**Yes: 8**

**No: 6**

**Split Yes and No or Maybe: 5**

**Need more information: 10**

**Task Force members who responded “yes” provided the following comments:**

- Yes, as long as our infrastructure can keep up with the growth.
- As a maturing city in a maturing region, we need to develop a more vibrant community with diverse options in jobs and housing.
- Need to figure out how to create that dynamic attractive place in order to accommodate what is projected.
- Request for more information on the fiscalization of housing. Need to promote housing types that will be fiscally beneficial to the city.
- Request for more information regarding the number of housing permits that would be needed to issue to accommodate these population projections.
- The General Plan should accommodate the projected growth and improve the processes along the way.

**Task Force members who responded “no” provided the following comments:**

- Request for more information on employment and housing lands within a 60 to 100 mile radius of San Jose.

- Need to solve the deficit problems by attracting more jobs and need to figure out how services can be located adjacent to housing so that less roads are needed and people can walk from their homes to meet their daily needs.
- Need to challenge job projections. How do we accommodate the projected growth and make ourselves an attractive job base?
- To proceed on this basis would be a continuation of bad planning that has happened over the last 20 years where the jobs are to the north and the housing to the south. This creates transportation and fiscal problems. We want to meet our obligation and we want other cities to meet their obligations as well. Taking these projections as a starting point is not being regionally minded.

**Task Force Members who responded with a split yes or no or maybe provided the following comments:**

- Yes on population but no on jobs.
- Yes on population and no on employment.
- Need to find a way to accommodate the population growth.
- Maybe, because the projections indicate that we will get two thirds of the county's growth and fifty percent of the jobs. It would not be beneficial to the city to use our land to accommodate these projections.
- Yes to population and no to jobs. There will be population growth, and we should plan for that.

**Task Force members who responded “I don't know, I need more information” provided the following comments:**

- More information is needed regarding what has already been accommodated in the current General Plan.
- Need more information on the implications of building more housing units before we can decide how much population growth to accommodate. The growth should be proportionate to our ability to provide services. There should be a balance between housing and jobs.
- More information is needed on economic data and projections.
- More information is needed on projected employment
- More fiscal data is needed
- Concern was raised regarding whether the younger workers earning lower working wages will be able to live here.
- Need more information on the fiscal implications of the population projections.

**c. Tentative Key Conclusions**

Most Task Force members (twenty five out of twenty nine) accepted the population and employment projections as the basis for the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update. Concerns were raised regarding the city's structural deficit, and the need to achieve a jobs-housing balance was identified. More information was requested on projected income levels, job growth and future employment trends.

Only a minority of the Task Force members indicated that the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update should accommodate Steve Levy's population and employment projections. The general sentiments of the other Task Force members were that the job projection numbers were not high enough and the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update should develop a strategy to attract more jobs. A number of Task Force members indicated that they need more fiscal and economic data to better understand the implications of these projections before they could agree that the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update should accommodate Steve Levy's jobs and population projections.

**4. Public Comment**

- Explore whether ABAG was accurate because they projected accurately or because they set the standard for what should occur in the future.
- The Urban Growth Boundary is restricting the production of housing, thereby raising the cost of housing and putting restraints on growth. Houston, Texas was presented as a good example of low housing costs with toll roads as a solution to congestion.
- San Jose's previous plans are failing. Integration of housing in the City fabric is poor. The quality of life is being negatively impacted. Do not to destroy the beautiful quality of life that we have now as a sacrifice for the future.
- There should be a maximum limitation on growth. If we get too many people we will lose open space and have traffic congestion. Consider the consequences of growth on the environment.
- San Jose is facing a structural deficit which will take time to fix.
- Concern regarding economic resources. We have the lowest tax rate per city our size. Develop a master plan and partnerships with corporations around the world to attract more tourists to increase the economic base of the City.
- The future of San Jose is impacted by what happens in the state, the country, and the world. The City's fiscal problem is related with our national problem. We need to understand these broader issues and trends before we can address them
- There needs to be an analysis or breakdown of income levels within the age categories and we need to identify the needs of the people within these age and income categories.
- Need vibrant urban living. These projections serve as a good basis for planning, but it is also important to follow the well-made plans.
- The growth of the aging population and the smaller numbers of the younger population will impact our needs for health care and affordable housing. We need a health care element in the General Plan.
- The implementation of City plans by the City Council and City planners should be addressed. When a plan needs to be revised, will the neighborhoods or the developers be considered as a priority?
- We can accommodate the growth and quality of life if we had more jobs. We should aim for more than one job per person. Eighty percent of the Job Growth comes from small businesses and companies that are less than ten years old. We need to determine how we can better nurture these businesses and encourage the formation of more new businesses.
- Why is Mr. Levy not comfortable with ABAG's projections? What is Palo Alto doing that Mr. Levy does not like?
- In order to attract young families, the City needs to work with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to improve the transportation system, deal with overcrowding in schools, and provide affordable housing options.
- In the past, decision makers in San Jose challenged previous growth projections by creating the urban growth boundary, establishing the greenbelt, and working with non-profit organizations to preserve agricultural lands. San Jose should again challenge those assumptions and take the lead in

shaping the future of San Jose.

- When identifying the type of housing needed in the future, we need to consider the ethnic breakdown of the younger population as well as household characteristics of the different ethnic groups.
- Concern was raised regarding low income affordable housing units backing into established neighborhoods. Such development contributes towards traffic congestion, reduces the desirability of established neighborhoods, and decreases the value of surrounding single family homes.
- Concern was raised regarding how City planners work with the neighborhoods and the developers. Planners need to listen to the concerns and needs of a neighborhood, and visit a given neighborhood and the proposed development sites before approving new development.

#### **4. Discussion on Work Program clarifications regarding Urban Growth Boundary, Historic Preservation and other topics**

The Task Force provided the following comments

- Request was made that all slides be distributed ahead of time.

#### **5. Overview of proposed Task Force Tour – Saturday, June 28, 2008**

The Task Force provided the following comments

- Request was made to have data on housing and job composition by region before the tour.
- Concern was raised regarding the logistics due to the public being invited on the tour.

#### **6. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Next Task Force Meeting is scheduled for Monday June 23, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.