



**Task Force Meeting No. 50 Synopsis
August 22, 2011**

Task Force Members Present*:

Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Pastor Oscar Dace, Pat Dando, Harvey Darnell, Brian Darrow, Dave Fadness, Nancy Ianni, Frank Jesse, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Shirley Lewis, Linda LeZotte, Sam Liccardo, Pierluigi Oliverio, David Pandori, Dick Santos, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Alofa Talivaa, Jim Zito.

Task Force Members Absent:

Jackie Adams, Enrique Fernandez, Leslee Hamilton, Sam Ho, Lisa Jensen, Matt Kamkar, Patricia Sausedo, Neil Struthers, Michael Van Every.

City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present*

Joe Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Susan Walton (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE), Dipa Chundur (PBCE), Wayne Chen (Housing), Nanci Klein (OED), Dave Mitchell (PRNS).

Public Present*:

Richard Loewke (iStar Project / Ed Storm), Brian Schmidt, Larry Ames, Terry Christensen (CommUniverCity), Steve Kline (Burbank Del Monte NAC), Roland Lebron (Save Our Trails), Marie Arnold, Trixie Johnson, Richard Zappelli (WGNA), Leah Toeniskoetter, Eric Ippolito, Helen Chapman (S/HPNA), Lorena Vidrio, Ralph Portillo, Susan Marsland.

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

1. Welcome

The meeting was convened at 6:36 p.m.

2. Review and approval of March 28, 2011 synopsis

The March 28, 2011 synopsis was approved.

3. Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan - Draft #7

Andrew Crabtree provided a summary of the series of drafts of the Envision Plan so far and explained that the current Draft #7 incorporates generally minor changes. Staff's presentation to highlight some of these changes, and update Envision outreach activities was followed by Task Force discussion.

Key changes from Draft # 6 and Village Planning Guidelines: John Baty explained that the 30 page document in the Task Force packet included only the areas where significant edits were made which are grouped by chapter. He highlighted these changes by topic areas including clarification of allowed land uses outside the Urban Growth Boundary, minor edits received through the EIR process, and edits to the village planning policies and process. He mentioned that staff has received good feedback from the Five Wounds community since staff and the community are currently working on developing village plans for that area. One of the key outcomes was to develop a set of Village Planning guidelines to be included as an appendix to the Envision Plan text document.

Envision Stakeholder Engagement efforts: John Baty also summarized the ongoing outreach effort and mentioned that staff has documented 168 specific outreach efforts so far to stakeholder groups and individuals, of which 24 have occurred since the last Task Force meeting (March 28, 2011). He highlighted that a significant effort had been made to reach out to the San Jose community, mostly residential, by sending out an Envision Brochure through San Jose's utility billing services to approximately 200,000 households.

Several of the Task Force members commented that they appreciated staff's work on the draft Envision Plan. One member asked if there had been efforts made to collaborate with other agencies and districts, specifically the school districts, since the village areas will likely have significant growth which might impact the schools. Another member asked Laurel Prevetti to provide a brief summary of her presentation to the School District Superintendents. Laurel explained that she presented the policies and related information on the data collected. She also mentioned that the districts are more focused on the near term impacts occurring due to current fiscal issues, but are definitely looking forward to future collaboration through the Village Planning process. Staff highlighted that the Draft Envision plan has polices related to potential school impacts and ongoing collaboration with school districts. Also staff has met with the various school districts earlier on in the Envision General Plan update process.

Another member expressed that the usage of the word "cultivate" in policy FS 2.6 might not appropriately convey what needs to be accomplished. Staff responded that the document under discussion did not include all the related policies in the draft plan and that staff has made an attempt to convey the broader concept in the Envision document and suggest various ways the City can generate ("grow") revenue.

Another member suggested that Policy MS17.2 should include the larger watershed area of surrounding communities rather than just referring to areas within San Jose city limits and asked for clarification on the reference to "non-native vegetation" in the Open Hillside Golf Course site description. Staff responded that the Task Force had previously discussed the degree to which non-native vegetation would be allowed.

Another Task Force member suggested that the last sentence relating to when parking plans might not been necessary should be deleted under Circulation and Parking in Appendix 6 (Village Planning). Another member asked what interim rules would apply to projects when the Envision Plan is adopted. Staff responded that typically the rules that are in place when the project is filed would apply, and that staff would be discussing this pipeline issue later under the of the Pipeline Projects agenda item.

Another Task Force member asked for clarification on the exceptions mentioned in LU-19.10(a) regarding preservation of the character of land outside the UGB, and specifically the percentage of land allowed to be potentially disturbed for development referenced in LU-19.10(e) as 50%, since 35% is mentioned elsewhere in the Draft Plan for golf courses. Clarification was also requested for how "floating designations" work, commenting that in this case to apply the policy, the golf course designation would apply to specify properties. Staff indicated revisions would be made to clarify. Staff clarified that Policy LU-19.10(a) referred to and incorporated the slope density formula that was carried over from the current San Jose 2020 General Plan.

Another Task Force member reminded the group that in its earlier vote, the Task Force was split 10-10-2 on the question of use of non-native vegetation in uses outside the UGB. The member also mentioned that the villages were identified to typically have a higher density housing with about 1000 sq ft per unit, and since this size is typically small for families with school aged

children, the potential impact to schools might not be accurate. This Task Force member stated it is important to have language to clarify that the typical unit size of 1000 sq ft is an average and that some units could be bigger and accommodate families with more children. An additional comment was that there is a need to make accommodation in future multi-family residential developments for both the younger and older generations that may not be able to climb stairs in a tri-level unit. Staff responded that the clarification will be included in final Draft Plan.

Another Task Force member suggested that Policy CE-1.7 on community engagement should include that outreach should be conducted in multiple languages when appropriate; that the language should be “cleaned up” and simplified in the first paragraph under Village Planning; and asked if there were any conflicts with the City’s zero waste goals. The member also asked if the Task Force was supportive of the height changes made to the Urban Village definition, pointing out that the draft Appendix 6 (Village Planning Guidelines) explicitly referenced 10 stories as a maximum limit. Staff clarified that the reference to the height is not designed to have height limits and that language can be included to the same effect.

One other Task Force member asked why policy IE 6.2 was edited to reference unemployed and low-income residents, and expressed concern that the proposed changed language would not be as strong as the original drafted language. Staff responded that the changes were made based on a subsequent Task Force member’s recommendation, and stated that staff would revert to the previous version following Task Force recommendation. Another Task Force member requested more specifics be included on truck routes as previously requested.

4. Proposed Implementation Actions (Pipeline Projects, Zoning Code Changes)

Zoning Code Changes: Andrew Crabtree gave a summary on the initial Zoning Code changes that would be required once the Envision General Plan is adopted. He described that staff has preliminarily categorized the changes according to the priority. He clarified that the Task Force can comment on these proposed code amendments but it is not necessary for them to make a formal recommendation.

Pipeline Projects: Andrew Crabtree explained that all projects that need a discretionary action have to be found in conformance to the General Plan by the decisionmaking body. Therefore, for projects that are filed prior to the adoption of the Envision 2040 General Plan, staff has drafted a provision that would allow projects to be found in conformance to the current San Jose 2020 General Plan Land Use/Transportation diagram as long as these projects meet the criteria set forth in Policy IP -1.9. Several Task Force members made comments and asked questions on these provisions, and staff clarified that the proposed pipeline project provision would provide for continued conformance to the Diagram designation, “the color on the land use map”. Staff clarified that in the draft policy, the San Jose 2020 General Plan polices would not continue to be applicable so as to not undermine the concepts, goals and policies of the Envision 2040 Plan. Staff explained further that the 18 month timeframe is provided to give both the applicants and staff time to work towards a project with better design that meets other goals of the Envision Plan and provide the applicant enough time to get all of the discretionary entitlements that are necessary to allow issuance of building permits. A few of the Task Force members requested that staff come back with an estimate of the number of projects that might qualify as pipeline projects. Joe Horwedel indicated that it would be difficult to provide a firm count as several hundred development projects are currently on file, but most are inactive.

5. Update on Five Wounds Urban Village Planning and Outreach Activities

Andrew Crabtree provided a brief update on the ongoing Five Wounds Village Planning process with a target for bringing four Village Plans to the City Council by the end of 2011. He also mentioned that the Planning Department had received a grant from the Health Trust to fund this project through the remainder of this calendar year.

6. Pending Land Use Alternatives and Requests

Andrew Crabtree provided a brief summary on the pending San Jose 2020 General Plan Amendments and Envision Requests. He mentioned that per City Council direction in January 2011, two of the pending General Plan Amendments were included in the Envision Draft PEIR to be studied as 'Options' (iStar and Rancho del Pueblo). He also stated that there are four pending Requests, and that more detailed analysis on each of the pending Requests and Amendments was included in the Task Force packet. Dipa Chundur gave a brief summary on each Amendment and Request, highlighting the requested 2040 land use designation and the current Envision designation on the Draft Diagram. Joe Horwedel added that staff has provided no recommendation yet on the two pending General Plan Amendments included as Residential Options in the PEIR, and that staff is still working with the applicants and community on these.

The Task Force was given an opportunity to discuss each project individually. The Task Force had no comment on the two General Plan Amendments/Residential Options, or on the first two Requests (properties on Gallup Dr/Blossom Hill Road and the Hitachi Campus). For the Request at Hamilton Avenue, one Task Force member expressed that the requested Mixed Use development could provide a transition between existing residential and commercial areas and asked if this proposed Envision designation allows for commercial activities. Staff responded that the Mixed Use designation would also allow for a residential-only project in the future, but clarified that since the property is within a Village, it would provide the opportunity to look at the whole area through the village planning process before allowing any "residential only" project to be constructed. On the Request on Mabury Road, one Task Force member mentioned that the requested Mixed Use designation might be appropriate to generate some retail uses, since the area currently has no walkable commercial use. Staff responded that the Residential Neighborhood designation proposed on the Draft Diagram would also allow for some commercial uses and would not provide for the potential of infill higher density residential of the requested Envision designation.

7. Draft Program PEIR: Summary of Comments Received

Andrew Crabtree summarized that the extended Draft PEIR public review period was completed on August 15th, and that staff received 89 comments. He mentioned that the comments can be generally categorized into three topic areas: first, the set of comments related to the Rancho del Pueblo Golf Course, requesting the site be kept as open space; second, comments requesting that traffic on Lincoln Avenue be studied in order to explore the possibility of reducing to one lane in each direction and introducing a middle turning lane; and third, comments from other agencies with suggestions or requesting minor clarifications. He also mentioned that staff is working towards the First Amendment for the PEIR which would include all responses to these comments,

and he provided the Task Force with the schedule for review of the PEIR and Envision Plan by the Planning Commission on September 28th and the City Council on October 25, 2011.

8. Public Comment

Five members of the public provided comments. The Vice Chair of the Five Wounds community thanked the Task Force and stated his appreciation for the efforts by Planning Staff to collaborate with the community. Mr. Ames asked staff to check the map as it showed the Three Creeks Trail along Alma St and also expressed support that Lincoln Avenue should be studied further to be reduced in number of lanes. He expressed that he was happy to see that the Envision Plan had been designed for people and not just cars.

Brian Schmidt mentioned that there are contradicting sentences in IP-1.3, asked how staff would present the Task Force's "split position" on the Open Hillside designation description to the City Council. He also suggested that language be included to avoid planting trees which were intolerant of use of recycled water.

Susan Marsland mentioned that she was concerned that the language in LU-19.4 for Open Hillside contradicts the water conservation goals, and that water usage is an issue for businesses. Richard Zappelli expressed his support to study Lincoln Avenue. He mentioned that the roadway is not safe with two fatalities out of the seven accidents occurring in the recent past.

9. Task Force Recommendations and Voting

Andrew Crabtree and John Baty summarized the Task Force suggestions regarding the edits to Envision Draft #7. One of the Task Force members mentioned that the City Council should be shown the two differing Task Force views on the Open Hillside/golf course issue. The motion passed to approve all changes including the above suggestion to provide two text options for golf course uses in Open Hillside. The proposed policy for Pipeline projects passed with one Task Force member in opposition as a request for more time to study the details of a policy related to pipeline projects. The Task Force unanimously endorsed the proposed land use designations as shown on the Draft Envision Land Use/Transportation Diagram for all pending General Plan Amendments and Envision Requests. The Task Force also approved a recommendation for the City Council to study Lincoln Avenue to analyze the potential for reducing the 4-lane roadway to two travel lanes and a turning lane.

10. Announcements

Andrew Crabtree mentioned that at the next Task Force meeting on September 12th, all Task Force members would have the opportunity to sign a "cover" page for inclusion in the final Envision 2040 General Plan document, and to provide their individual comments on the Plan and the Update process. He also requested that Task Force members provide feedback to staff using the questionnaires provided.

11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.