



Task Force Meeting Synopsis June 23, 2008

Task Force Members Present*:

Co-Chair Shirley Lewis, Co-Chair Sam Liccardo, Vice-Chair David Pandori, Jackie Adams, Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Frank Chavez, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Pastor Oscar Dace, Pat Dando, Harvey Darnell, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Dave Fadness, Sam Ho, Dan Hoang, Nancy Ianni, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Matt Kamkar, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Linda LeZotte, Pierluigi Oliverio, Jenniffer Rodriguez, Dick Santos, Patricia Sausedo, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Neil Struthers, Alofa Talivaa, Michael Van Every, and Jim Zito.

Task Force Members Absent:

Yolanda Cruz, Enrique Fernandez, and Leslee Hamilton.

City Staff and Other Public Agencies Present*:

Ru Weerakoon (Mayor's Office), Jessica Garcia-Kohl (Mayor's Office), Roma Dawson (Councilmember Liccardo's Office), Peter Hamilton (Councilmember Chirco's Office), Nanci Klein (OED), Jacky Morales-Ferrand (Housing), Junko Vroman (ESD), 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 May 27, 2008 Meeting Synopsis

The following correction was requested:

- Task Force member Pat Dando is not noted as absent.
- The synopsis indicates that Steve Levy's report on population and employment projections were accepted as the basis for the General Plan Update San Jose 2040, but also indicates that there is additional information that needs to be reviewed. The synopsis should clarify that, while the report was not accepted, the numbers in this report would not yet be used as basis for the General Plan Update.
- The fourth bullet from bottom of page 5 should address the need to study the structural impediments associated with employment.

The synopsis, as revised, was approved.

3. Development of Land Use Scenarios

Outcome: Identification of Initial Draft Guidelines for the development of Land Use Scenarios, to be expanded and updated based on future Task Force information and discussions.

- a. **Context for Discussion of Land Use Scenario Development Process – Stan Ketchum, Principal Planner with the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement**
- b. **Changing Forces, Changing City – Kim Walesh, Chief Strategist with the City of San Jose Office of Economic Development**

Task Force comments and input:

- The City should not be tied to current land use policies when addressing employment growth. There is currently a resistance to converting employment lands to housing. But statistics indicate there is a shrinking workforce, so there will be a surplus of employment lands. The densification of employment will create trends that will change land uses and land use. Studies indicate there is a need to make cities more dense. We need to study employment factors and how to house employees, as well as the densification of cities.
- It would be interesting to see the values on green dividends for Portland and Chicago. It would be useful to run the same model in San Jose.
- There is a reliance on shared amenities. The Planning Commission struggles with the issue of private versus common open space.
- It is critical to attract the 20 to 40 year old demographic. Those people choose where they live first, and then find a job. The innovation districts and dynamic urban settings that attract this demographic are lacking in San Jose. We need to figure out where to create them. The existing specific plans need to be updated to maximize housing opportunities in those areas.
- Need to look at the impediments of creating the services that the younger generation wants.
- Would like to see services that make an area successful. Need to get people out of their cars to the services that they need.
- There is a shift from industrial parks to innovation districts. Need to know the distinctions between an innovation district and an industrial park.
- The existing industrial parks are generally single use and include one to two story tilt up buildings surrounded by parking and large blocks. Innovation districts include mixed uses, higher density along transit, higher quality architecture, offices, and value is placed on public spaces (recreation spaces, trails, hangout spaces, cafés, etc.).
- Need to look at how cities are being funded. San Jose does not have the funding to provide the services that attract people.
- San Jose is in an identity crisis. The City is still planned like a suburban city. We need to understand what an urban city should look like and how to build it.
- Need to focus on the health care industry. It is an industry that pays well and has career growth. The demand for college educated people will be in health care.
- There is a gap in wages. Employers will look for people with college degrees, but these jobs do not necessarily pay more. As cities attract young professionals, there is a loss of middle-income people. Need to address the issue of who we want to attract, and how to plan for them.
- San Jose is challenged with a large existing suburban population. It is important find a way to keep hold of the existing suburban neighborhoods while intensifying throughout the City.
- There is an article in the Economist about how the younger generation is driving economic growth. Young families grow the most.

- Need to address energy trends. The General Plan Update is an opportunity to plan for a self-sufficient city where we can provide and generate our own energy. Could also make money by selling energy to others that cannot produce it.
- Need to look at the needs of mid-management (25 – 45 years old) and baby boomers (65+ years old). Austin, Scottsdale, and Denver try to attract both these demographics. The mid-management years are the bearing time for families, and the time when workers are the most aggressive at pursuing careers. These cities also want to provide housing opportunities for baby boomers that want to move out of their single-family homes into different housing, but still stay within the city. As baby boomers move out, it opens up more housing for mid management families to move into. These cities are seeing greater growth and stability.
- European cities have the kinds of qualities we want now. Lincoln Avenue in Willow Glen is a great example of a suburban neighborhood area. Would like to keep pushing that model out.
- The industrial park could include retail below and office above. Need to keep industrial lands and parks, but need to change what they look like and how people think of them.
- Need to support San Jose State University (SJSU). SJSU brings students to San Jose, but we need to retain them and keep them in San Jose.
- San Jose has done good job of recognizing cultural districts. This is important because young people are looking for multi-cultural experiences. There should be multicultural districts in all neighborhood business districts (NBDs).

c. Check-in on the Draft Envision San Jose 2040 Vision Statement – Michael Brilliot, Senior Planner with the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Questions for Discussion:

1. Are there new ideas for Kim Walesh's presentation, assigned readings, or recent Great Cities Speakers that should be incorporated into the Draft Vision?
 2. Are there specific goals that need to be highlighted or made more explicit beyond that stated in the Draft Vision or the Guiding Principles?
- There was a previous conversation about the draft vision statement. Comments from that discussion have not yet been incorporated. Do not want to give feedback again, and still not have it be incorporated.
 - It would be helpful to see the notes from the last time the vision was discussed.
 - The vision should address healthy communities and job quality.
 - Suggested having an ongoing list of comments.
 - The City is out of balance. The housing stock is 75% single-family detached. There are few opportunities to live in an urban setting. The vision needs to include language that addresses different housing choices.
 - Housing is a regional issue. Employers are drawing from the Bay Area as whole. People need to make decisions that are balanced on housing and transportation. Proposition 13 makes it difficult to make housing transitions.
 - Should focus on just the text of the vision, and add the pictures and graphics later.
 - Need to focus on fiscal and economic issues. The City needs money to create amenities. The 25 to 35 year old demographic will not want to live in San Jose without the amenities they want.
 - Need to address historic resources. San Jose is the oldest city in California and the state's first capital. There are a lot of resources that can be preserved and capitalized on to attract tourism.
 - Make Fiscal Sustainability its own, separate key Vision Element.

d. Identification of Initial Draft Guidelines for the development of Land Use Scenarios – Michael Brilliot

Questions for Discussion:

1. Do the initial draft guidelines reflect the Draft Vision, Guiding Principles and the present thinking of the Task Force?
2. Are the initial draft guidelines the right framework to guide the development of land use scenarios?
3. Are there additional guidelines that should be considered?

The Discussion on focused on the Guideline related to Innovative Economy and Vibrant Arts and Culture. Task Force comments and input below:

- Need to identify and address the underserved areas of the city.
- The guidelines target jobs, but not housing permits. There will be 1,300 housing permits issued in 2008, which include both affordable and market range units. That number is low for a metropolitan city. Would like to issue more housing permits for all types of housing. A quantifiable target should be established for housing production.
- Guideline #8: Should add “resource conservation” (use less water, or recycle) to support the goal of being a self-sufficient city.
- Guideline #19: Should not focus on just Downtown San Jose. There are other areas of the City that are cultural and symbolic.
- Guideline #4: The ideas that Kim Walesh and Steve Levy have regarding dynamic urban settings, housing types, and living choices need to be better captured. It will be difficult to create “hubs” throughout the City that will attract global/mobile people.
- Guideline #7: Commend addressing heavy and light industrial uses. Manufacturing is a critical piece in California. Should there be protections or incentives on industrial land? Want clean-tech jobs. Clean-tech jobs are high-quality and high-paying jobs.
- Need to protect health care land and facilities, in terms of employment.
- The retail demands of residents of business need to be addressed. The General Plan should develop strategies to attract people to San Jose.
- Innovative Economy Guidelines: Need to incorporate the arts community into the economy. Could create arts corridors Downtown. The arts also help the economy.
- Tourism should be addressed. Tourism brings people to the City.
- Manufacturing is not dead in San Jose. There are three new manufacturing facilities in Edenvale focusing on the solar industry.
- Innovative Economy Guidelines: There should be a more overt reference to economic development and housing.
- Vibrant Arts and Culture Guidelines: There are existing cultural resources. They should be identified and addressed.
- Guideline #8: Need to add energy.
- Guidelines #5 and #10: These guidelines should be combined. Should co-locate complimentary opportunities. Having industrial/economic complexes that include hotels, mixed use, amenities, restaurants, and things to do during the lunch hour would help accommodate different phases of business development.
- Guideline #5: If we only plan to accommodate 200,000 new jobs, we would be in the same jobs/housing ratio as we are in today. The number is too low and would not improve the fiscal stability of the City.
- Need to address the idea of the home office. More employment will be manifested in the home, not in an industrial park. If the City is going to accommodate 250,000 new jobs, how many are going to be in the neighborhood, and how is that going to affect housing?

- Some of the employment in the City can occur in residential areas. Rather than forcing small businesses to apply for a General Plan amendment, there should be an overlay that allows small businesses to operate in neighborhoods.
- Guideline #6: Coyote Valley is not mentioned as an employment area. The existing General Plan designates 50,000 jobs in North Coyote Valley. That was planned 26 years ago and based on the assumption that corporations wanted monolithic development on the peripheral of the City. That type of development does not support our vision.
- Would like to see numbers that include Coyote Valley and do not include Coyote Valley. Building out Coyote Valley the way it is planned now does not meet our goals.
- Guideline #10: The new retail approved (e.g. The Plant and Market Center shopping centers) does not support these guidelines. Retail developers have a certain business plan that works which conflicts with what we are trying to do. This guideline is not going to be easy to achieve.
- Innovative Economy Guidelines: There is a new industry of small farms that provide produce to restaurants (urban farming). There is a negative environmental consequence of transporting food. Need to address how to support the urban environment diet. Need to encourage manufacturing facilities to be a zero-waste business.
- Guideline #5: Need to attract well-paying jobs.
- Guideline #7: Should move the words, “in 2040”, to the end of the sentence. The guideline should read: “..lands are available to meet or exceed the projected needs of residents and businesses *in 2040*.” The land should be available for our needs in the year 2040.
- Guideline #8: Should have a separate guideline that addresses the economic uses that support a fiscally sustainable city.
- Need to perform midterm checks on the progress of goals.
- Guidelines #3 and #15: Should address healthy foods in guideline #3. One component of a neighborhood friendly village is that the food is emphasized. The City has a difficult time bringing grocery stores to neighborhoods.
- There are existing planned and proposed transit corridors. But some of the proposed transit corridors do not have funding, so plans are based on something that is not financed. That is not sustainable.
- Improving the fiscal health of the City should be a guideline that every decision is measured against.
- Future agendas should include more time for Task Force members to have an open dialogue and a chance to respond to each other.

4. Announcements

- a. Status report on Task Force attendance**
- b. Great Cities Speaker Series (July 14th)**
- c. Update on Task Force Tour – Saturday, June 28**

5. Public Comment

- San Jose could work with the sister cities program and generate tourism. There needs to be more cultural community centers that include gift shops, traveling exhibits, etc. New jobs should not be restricted to just high tech. Need to make sure new jobs include good wages and benefits.
- Kim Walesh’s presentation was interesting. San Jose should include areas where you can shop, rest, eat, and be entertained all in one place without driving. There needs to be great public destinations, schools, and services along transit lines. Streetscapes need to be improved to encourage walking and biking.

- Putting high density housing adjacent to public transit while at the same time reducing parking is bad. There is not a plan to improve public transit. This Task Force needs to look at parking and public transit as two components of planning for the future.
- The General Plan Update process will change the whole structure of the City. If we are encouraging people live locally, there needs to be locally grown food and open garden areas.
- Values need to be brought up to date. There should be at least one public forum in each Council district so residents can provide meaningful input. When decisions are made without public forums, it creates opposition.
- Public medical care should be considered.
- There needs to be sustainable agriculture.
- Coyote Valley should not be developed. The City should focus on infill housing and higher densities.
- Would like to see San Jose have more village nodes with retail shops. Important to keep parks, plazas, and shops to maintain the quality of life. Need to keep San Jose a place where people want to live.
- Suggested doing an analysis that includes and excludes Coyote Valley and the Alamden Urban Reserve. The Coyote Valley Draft EIR for Coyote Valley addressed the jobs/housing balance. The Draft EIR indicated that the City's goal was 1.1 full time jobs for each full time resident. That would result in a net increase of housing demand.
- Mayfair is located in a depressed area of San Jose, in between two newer areas. There is an 81-acre private property that could accommodate something innovative (e.g. Santana Row).
- Locating businesses Downtown should be a priority. Downtown will never thrive unless companies are located there. Need to showcase what San Jose already has. There could be a "Silicon Row" that showcases the latest and greatest products.
- There needs to be a hospital located Downtown. There is a contradiction between attracting businesses and providing jobs that provide living wages. But people who own their own businesses are looking for maximum profits by reducing labor costs. That is a contradiction. There needs to be incentives that provide living wages so employees feel like they are getting something from being in San Jose rather than being somewhere else.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:15 p.m.

Next Task Force Meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 28, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.