



**Task Force Meeting No. 22 Synopsis
May 26, 2009**

Task Force Members Present*:

Co-Chair Sam Liccardo, Co-Chair Shirley Lewis, Vice-Chair David Pandori, Jackie Adams, Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Frank Chavez, Pastor Oscar Dace, Pat Dando, Harvey Darnell, Dave Fadness, Enrique Fernandez, Leslee Hamilton, Sam Ho, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Matt Kamkar, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Pierluigi Oliverio, Jennifer Rodriguez, Dick Santos, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Neil Struthers, Alofa Talivaa, Jim Zito.

Task Force Members Absent:

Frank Chavez, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Mary Creasman, Yolanda Cruz, Nancy Ianni, Linda LeZotte, Patricia Sausedo, Michael Van Every.

City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present*

Anthony Drummond (Council Office, D2), Junko Vroman (ESD), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Lauren Doud (ESD), Edesa Bitbadal (Council Office, D4), Jennifer Malutta (Council Office, D8), Roma Dawson (Council Office, D3) Peter Hamilton (Council Office, D9), Kathy Sutherland (Council Office, D10), Joseph Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), Michael Brilliot (PBCE), Lee Butler (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE)

Public Present*:

Helen Chapman, (Shasta Hanchett Neighborhood Association), Larry Ames, Tanya Diamond, Jyelle, Lyrod, Richard Corin (De Anza College), Minh Nguyen (De Anza College), Han Ly (De Anza College), Isidro A. Raymundo (De Anza College), Megan Fluk (Sierra Club), Virginia Thomas, Peter Rothschild (Coyote Valley), Peter Benson (Coyote Valley), Steve Dunn (Legacy), Christine Choi, Michele Korpos, Andrew Judaprawira (AIESEC), Mike Selvog, Floyd Rowe, Katie Hoffman (Save Coyote Valley), Travis Smith (The Health Trust), Trixie Johnson (League of Women Voters), Patricia Walsh (OCA), Eric Lomori (MSTEK), Jennifer Ralston (SJSU), Erik Hayden (RUP), Craig Edgenton, Jack Nadeau (Greater Palm Haven N.A.), Leah Toeniskoetter, Anna Le, Daniel Lopretta, Dylan Crutchfield, Kan Parthiban, Beau Slorana, Brett Howard, Ryan Phillips (De Anza College), Cristina Galvan (De Anza College), Jaki Phillips (De Anza College), Rick Malupo (De Anza College), Pete Rausa (De Anza College), Ping Sun Chin (De Anza College), Trang Bui (De Anza College), Christina Matinez (De Anza College), Trista Chung (Foothill College), Craig Breon, Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Terri Balandra (Fiesta Lanes Action Group), Darren Ponce (Sierra Club), Padmaja Iyer (De Anza College), Jana Clark (De Anza College), Katie Louey (AIESEC S.J.), Alex Chui (AIESEC S.J.), Rich Hetner

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

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at 6:35 p.m.

2. Review and approval of April 27, 2009 Synopsis

April 27, 2009 Synopsis approved.

3. Staff Presentations

Lee Butler provided information in response to Task Force direction from the April 27, 2009 Task Force meeting and provided a synopsis of feedback received at the May 20th community meeting and the May 22nd meeting with some of the property owners of Evergreen Campus Industrial, South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve, and Coyote Valley Urban Reserve. Lee presented staff's recommendation for the geographic distribution of growth in land use scenarios J and K, introduced the other land areas (Evergreen Campus Industrial, South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve, and Coyote Valley Urban Reserve) which the Task Force would consider that evening. Joe Horwedel concluded the presentation by framing the Task Force's discussion and highlighting the Task Force and community input, service delivery cost consideration and environmental concerns that helped to shape staff's recommendation.

4. Discussion of the geographic distribution of jobs and housing in Study Scenarios J and K, including consideration of the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve, South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve, and Evergreen Campus Industrial properties.

The Task Force broke discussed this item in four parts: Evergreen Campus Industrial properties, South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve, Coyote Valley Urban Reserve, and Scenarios J & K.

Evergreen Campus Industrial (ECI):

Staff recommendation is that, in all of the four Land Use study scenarios, the Evergreen Campus Industrial area be retained for employment uses, with no housing capacity studied.

A brief history of the 1980's land swap between Berryessa and ECI lands was provided by a Task Force member.

Another Task Force member indicated that the ECI area is in a bad location for Campus Industrial uses, adding that under a previous potential development scenario considered by the community and the City Council (but never adopted), Evergreen residents were initially supportive of additional housing in Evergreen only because of the significant amount of extra amenities that were offered in conjunction with the residential uses. The same Task Force member went on to say that he did not support residential development on the ECI properties. Several other Task Force members also made comments in opposition to planning for residential use on the ECI properties, citing the high cost of providing city services to this area and the area's separation from transit.

Other Task Force members agreed that the ECI area is not an ideal location for employers either, given that it has poor freeway access and poor visibility. Task Force members questioned what businesses or types of businesses would locate in the ECI area. Other Task Force members debated this point, stating that the area could be an attractive location for green businesses, biotech, and research and development facilities that desire a remote, IBM-like campus.

Other general Task Force comments cited the need to support the Evergreen village and the need for public transit in Evergreen. The question of outreach to the ECI property owners was posed, and staff responded that the Evergreen property owners had been notified and invited to an outreach meeting.

South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve (SAVUR):

Joe Horwedel led the discussion by stating that a review by Planning concluded that the development potential of SAVUR was approximately 800 units (not 2,000 as shown in the San Jose 2020 General Plan text) and that development in this area would carry a high cost for the provision of city services. Joe stated staff's recommendation is that no housing or job growth be considered in the South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve in any of the four Land Use Study Scenarios. Several Task Force members concurred that the cost of city services for residences in this area would be very high.

Task Force members raised the issue of choices, noting that development of new retirement communities and new single-family detached residences will be needed, not just high-density, transit-oriented development. Task Force members debated whether assurance of these development types would be the Task Force's responsibility or the developers' (market driven) responsibility. Other Task Force members stated that San Jose is already comprised largely of single family neighborhoods and that the focus should shift to providing higher density housing along transit.

A number of Task Force members expressed concern that outreach to Almaden Valley property owners was inadequate and that they would abstain from voting on this matter. Staff indicated that an additional outreach meeting for all SAVUR and Coyote Valley Urban Reserve property owners would be held prior to the City Council Hearing on June 16th.

The Task Force raised the issue of open space and trail connections through the SAVUR, questioning whether some development could facilitate open space and trail connectivity.

Coyote Valley Urban Reserve (CVUR):

Staff recommended that no housing or jobs growth be considered in the Mid-Coyote Valley Urban Reserve in any of the four Land Use Study Scenarios.

Several Task Force members generally spoke in opposition to development in the CVUR, primarily citing its location (far from transit), high costs for the provision of city services, and the potential for environmental degradation. Task Force members questioned what the best mechanisms would be to preserve open space and agriculture in CVUR.

Concern was again expressed by some Task Force Members that additional outreach should have been made to Coyote Valley property owners. These Task Force members said that they would therefore abstain from voting on this matter.

Scenarios J & K:

Task Force members inquired about the added capacity to Downtown and whether the capacity incorporated in some of the higher growth scenarios should also be included in the lower growth scenarios. Staff responded that the added capacity was on sites with less development potential

and that lower-growth scenarios need capacity added into villages to create the development potential/critical mass to create great places.

5. Public Comment

Approximately 42 members of the public spoke during the public comment period.

Nearly every speaker specifically opposed development in the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve, typically stating that it should be used for agriculture, open space and/or wildlife habitat. Maintaining wildlife habitat to continue the area's function as a wildlife corridor between the Santa Cruz and Diablo Mountain Ranges was a focus of many speakers. Several speakers also cited the numerous special status plant and animal species in the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve that could be impacted by development. Other speakers cited the potential for the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve to be used as a sustainable agriculture model and/or for eco-tourism. A few of the speakers said the North Coyote Campus Area should also be preserved, and not developed with employment uses as currently planned.

In addition to the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve development opposition, approximately five speakers specifically opposed development in the South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve.

One member of the public said that the City needs to conduct more outreach to property owners in Coyote Valley, Almaden Valley and the Evergreen Campus Industrial area before Council makes a decision on these areas.

No public comments specifically related to Scenarios J or K were received.

6. Task Force Voting

a. *Potential Use of Evergreen Campus Industrial Properties*

The Task Force voted unanimously, 27 to 0, to recommend that the Evergreen Area Campus Industrial Area be retained for employment uses in all four Land Use Study Scenarios; Task Force Members Chirco, Chavez, Chronert, Cruz, Ianni, LeZotte, Sausedo and Van Every were absent.

b. *Potential Use of South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve*

Nineteen Task Force members voted to recommend that growth not be considered in the South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve, two Task Force members voted against this motion and six Task Force members abstained. Eight Task Force members were absent as noted above.

c. *Potential Use of Coyote Valley Urban Reserve*

Twenty-one Task Force members voted to recommend that no growth be considered in the Mid-Coyote Valley Urban Reserve, two Task Force members voted against this motion and four Task Force members abstained. Eight Task Force members were absent as noted above.

d. *Geographic Distribution of Growth in Scenario J*

The Task Force voted unanimously, 25 to 0, in support of staff recommendation on the geographic distribution of jobs and housing growth capacity in Scenario J; for a more detailed description of the proposed distribution of growth capacity in Scenario J refer to the Council Memo dated May 26, 2009. Task Force members Dando and Rodriguez left the meeting prior to the vote, increasing the number of Task Force members absent to ten. There were no public comments specifically related to Scenario J.

e. *Geographic Distribution of Growth in Scenario K*

Twenty-five of the 23 Task Force members voted to support the staff recommendation on the geographic distribution of jobs and housing growth capacity in Scenario K. Two Task Force members voted against the staff recommendation. Ten Task Force members were absent, as noted above. There were no public comments specifically related to Scenario K.

7. Announcements

Staff made no announcements to the group.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned shortly after 9:30 p.m.