

**TO: Envision San José 2040  
Task Force**

**FROM: Andrew Crabtree**

**SUBJECT: June 28, 2010  
TASK FORCE MEETING #42**

**DATE: June 22, 2010**

---

This memorandum provides information to assist you in preparing for the June 28, 2010 Envision San José 2040 Task Force Meeting. Links to the referenced documents and other resource materials (e.g., reading materials and correspondence) are posted on the Envision website.

Please note that this is the final meeting scheduled for Phase 2 of the Envision process. This meeting will conclude the Task Force discussion and recommendations for the key components of the General Plan update which define the project description. The project description will be used by the Planning staff and our environmental consultants as we prepare an Environmental Impact Report to allow consideration of the General Plan update by the City Council in June 2011.

Phase 3 of the Envision process for the Task Force will begin in September, and will focus on review of draft documents, including the draft General Plan, community engagement and additional refinement of General Plan implementation tools.

The Envision Work Program is available under the “What’s New” heading on the Envision internet site at: [http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/gp\\_update/default.asp](http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/gp_update/default.asp).

### **Agenda Item 3 – Land Use / Transportation Diagram**

The June 28<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting is the final opportunity for the Task Force to review and provide comments on the draft Land Use / Transportation Diagram before the Diagram is provided to the City’s environmental consultants as part of the General Plan project description that serves as the basis for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. The Diagram was previously discussed by the Task Force at both the April 26<sup>th</sup> and May 17<sup>th</sup> Task Force meetings, and by the community at a Workshop on May 15<sup>th</sup>. Since that time, staff has revised the Diagram based on Task Force and public comments to-date, and additional staff research and analysis of some areas of the City.

The draft Land Use / Transportation Diagram supports the development of land uses and a transportation network consistent with the Vision, goals and policies developed through the Envision process, including the following key concepts:

1. **Preferred Land Use Scenario** – The draft Diagram designates job and housing lands consistent with the amount and location of growth capacity identified within the Preferred Land

Use Scenario. The Land Use / Transportation Diagram designations within the identified Growth Areas support levels of intensification consistent with the planned amounts of job and housing growth.

2. **Villages** – Village areas are identified on the draft Diagram through a “*Village*” designation which supports intensified mixed-use development on specific properties and through a “*Village Overlay*” designation which identifies the boundaries of the general Village and Corridor areas that should be considered as part of the preparation of a Village Plan. The Village Plan will further refine the planned land uses within the Village Overlay area, identifying uses, densities and development form for specific Village areas in greater detail.
3. **Plan Horizons** – Sites planned for redevelopment within the Village and Corridor Growth Areas included in Horizon 1 are designated as “*Village*” which supports mixed-use development including residential following completion of a Village Plan. Redevelopment sites within the Village and Corridor Growth Areas in Horizon 2 through Horizon 5 are designated for employment use, most typically commercial. When the City Council makes the decision to begin future Plan growth Horizons, the *Village* designation would be applied to appropriate sites to identify the potential for residential growth in those additional locations citywide.
4. **Employment Growth** – To support the ambitious amount of job growth needed to achieve the Jobs / Employed Resident (J/ER) ratio goal of 1.3, as planned in the Preferred Land Use Scenario, the draft Land Use / Transportation Diagram includes an increased amount of land within San Jose planned for employment uses. While the draft Diagram maintains the City’s established residential neighborhoods, the draft Diagram adds an employment designation on some sites that are either currently vacant or currently in use for employment activities. Ideally, more employment lands should be identified to fully support the Envision job growth goal; however, the opportunities to add employment lands are limited by the degree to which the City is already largely developed with residential uses, and other factors.
5. **Transit-Orientation** – The concept of the Village, Corridor, and other Identified Growth Areas primarily focuses new residential and employment growth in areas that are served by existing or future transit. The draft Diagram supports this concept by applying designations that allow for growth in transit areas.
6. **Mixed Use** – Land Use Designations which illustrate and support areas encouraged for existing or future mixed-use development, either with a residential or commercial focus, have been added on the draft Diagram at locations throughout the City.
7. **Vacant Lands** – Based on a careful review of lands identified as “vacant” or “under-utilized” on the Vacant Land Inventory maintained by the Planning Division to identify future mixed-use opportunities, several sites were identified as having limited development potential based on a combination of public ownership, parcel configuration and geographic features. For example, several properties within creek areas owned by the Water District are designated as “*Open Space, Park, Habitat*” rather than for urban uses as they have been previously.

8. **Simplified Diagram** – Many Land Use/Transportation Diagram designations from the San Jose 2020 General Plan were combined and consolidated in the Land Use/Transportation Diagram for the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan. Over 90 designations in the San Jose 2020 General Plan were evaluated, and they have been consolidated into fewer than 30 designations for the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan.

To facilitate discussion at this meeting, staff had asked that Task Force members review the draft Land Use/Transportation Diagram and forward any written comments to staff at least one week in advance of the June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. Staff received a limited number of comments that have been incorporated into the current draft proposed Diagram or draft Goals & Policies as appropriate.

Task Force member Pastor Oscar Dace suggested that industrial lands in proximity to existing residential or school uses should be redesignated with the *Combined Industrial / Commercial* designation to allow for churches and private community gathering facilities. Pastor Oscar Dace suggested that this area would serve as a transition zone between sensitive residential uses and those industrial lands where new residential would not be allowed. While staff did redesignate a number of industrial properties to *Combined Industrial / Commercial* (such as the west side of Oakland Road, south of Highway 101), staff does not recommend that this proposed change be applied universally to the Land Use/Transportation Diagram, as it would erode lands that are designated exclusively for industrial uses, and reduce the supply of lands designated *Light Industrial* and *Heavy Industrial*. The draft Diagram increases the amount of *Combined Industrial / Commercial* and other commercially designated lands, thereby increasing the number of sites with a designation that supports the development of Private Community Gathering Spaces.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions**

The June 28, 2010 Task Force meeting provides the Task Force with a final opportunity to review Draft General Plan Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions (Policies) before they are provided to the environmental consultants. Working with staff, the environmental consultants will use the draft Policies to refine the project description which is the basis for completion of an Environmental Impact Report. While the Task Force will continue to have opportunities to review the proposed General Plan text document and Land Use / Transportation Diagram, further changes to those documents should focus on issues which will not result in new potential environmental impacts beyond those already evaluated as part of the project description.

The Task Force should understand that the Task Force must complete its review of the key concepts expressed in these policy documents at this point in the Envision process in order to allow the preparation of the environmental impact report on schedule, in order to achieve the General Plan Update hearing by the City Council in June 2011.

Policy topics identified as “consent” items will only be discussed if Task Force members request to address specific items included within the draft documents. The Task Force should note that individual comments on clarity or wording concerns on any of the policies can be forwarded to staff at any time.

The agenda items on Consent are:

- a) Arts and Culture
- b) Education
- c) Infrastructure
- d) Fiscal Sustainability (revised)
- e) Trails
- f) Land Use – Private Community Gathering Facilities (revised), Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary
- g) Community Safety – Emergency Management, Police and Fire, Code Enforcement

Staff recommends that the majority of the time available for Task Force discussion be dedicated to the Policies for the key topics of:

- h) Economic Development (revised)**
- i) General Plan Implementation (revised)**

a) Arts and Cultural Development (*consent*)

The Arts and Cultural Development goals were discussed by the Task Force on June 22, 2009. Over the past year, the Office of Cultural Affairs (OCA) has led a community-wide planning process to develop a comprehensive cultural vision plan, now called *Cultural Connection*. A cultural vision for San Jose was developed through this planning process which involved more than 800 people through focus group meetings, two town hall meetings, Arts Commission study sessions, stakeholder interviews, and 711 responses to an online cultural plan survey. The *Envision San Jose 2040* wikiplanning survey, with over 2,750 of respondents, also informed *Cultural Connection*. A primary outcome of this process was the development of a set of goals to inform *Envision San Jose 2040*.

The goal of fostering cultural development builds on both community and economic development goals, resulting in great public value. As San Jose develops, planning for San Jose's cultural growth, with emphasis on spaces and places for cultural participation, is integral to its future.

*Arts and Cultural Development Goals, Policies, and Implementation Actions* support the Vibrant Arts and Culture element of the City's Vision. Guiding principles of these goals include cultural participation, cultural pluralism, arts and economic prosperity, innovation and the public value of the arts. The desired outcome of these Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions will include: full integration of arts and cultural activities in San Jose's neighborhoods; a thriving arts community city-wide; a downtown that is the cultural center of Silicon Valley; high impact public art throughout the community; and the cultivation of San Jose as a cultural destination.

b) Education (*consent*)

The draft *Education Policies* retain or update existing school policies from the current General Plan, and incorporate additional policies that reflect the importance of early and continued cooperation and coordination between school districts, the City, and the development community, particularly in considering potential locations for school facilities. The *Education Policies* were shared with San José School District Superintendents at the June 16, 2010 Schools/City Collaborative meeting. The Superintendents were asked to provide comments and were also invited to attend the June 28<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting.

c) Infrastructure (Consent)

The draft *Infrastructure Policies* address the efficient management of the City's infrastructure, level of service standards for stormwater conveyance and sanitary sewer lines, operation of the Water Pollution Control Plant, operation of materials recovery (MRF) and landfill facilities and installations for telecommunications. These policies focus on the physical infrastructure provided by or regulated by the City and closely relate to the policies for Fiscal Stability, General Plan implementation and Environmental Leadership (e.g., Recycling / Zero Waste, Water Supply, and Water Recycling). The draft Policies revise and expand upon those found in the San Jose 2020 General Plan to better address the fiscal and environmental goals identified through the Envision process, as well as current technology and best practices.

d) Fiscal Sustainability (Consent)

The proposed *Fiscal Sustainability and Urban Service Area Policies* were discussed by the Task Force on May 24, 2010 and also briefly by the Task Force on June 7, 2010. As requested by the Task Force, the policy has been added to the draft document to state that the City will not extend services to the South Almaden Valley and Mid-Coyote Valley Urban Reserves until after 2040, beyond the timeframe of this General Plan Update. The Policies were also revised to provide more clarity and certainty in how evaluations will occur for projects that propose conversion of employment lands to non-employment uses (see Policies FS-3.3 through FS-3.6b).

e) Trails (Consent)

The *Trail Network Goals & Policies* will lead to an interconnected and well-distributed network of trail systems to support recreation and commuting. The Trail Network Goals and Policies support: active transportation by developing trail alignments that link housing, commercial, and retail uses; recreation by linking park sites and connecting to regional trail systems; and environmental protection by permitting stakeholders to access, enjoy, and protect open spaces and natural resources. The Policies in this section work together with those in the Circulation section and the Parks, Trails, Open Space, and Recreation Amenities/Programs section of the Plan to promote bicycle use for transportation and recreational purposes in San Jose.

f) Land Use (Private Community Gathering Facilities, Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary) (Consent)

The Task Force previously discussed *Private Community Gathering Facilities Policies* at their June 7, 2010 meeting. Private Community Gathering Facilities include buildings and sites used for religious activities, private clubs, performance venues, and school or sports activities. These types of activities have similar potential land use impacts and considerations because they generally involve the assembly of large groups of people. These uses serve valuable social and cultural roles in the community, and the *Private Community Gathering Facilities Policies* support the location of these facilities where they are accessible to the San Jose's residents, such as Villages and residential areas. These Policies also limit the location of these facilities at sites that could result in potential health, safety or other land use incompatibility risks for the people they serve.

Included in the packet materials are a number of suggestions from Task Force Member Pastor Oscar Dace regarding the Private Community Gathering Facilities Policies. Pastor Dace has proposed additional flexibility for the location of religious assembly uses. Specifically, Pastor Dace proposes that religious assembly uses should be allowed to be considered in all locations that are at a specified certain distance away from Heavy Industrial lands. While staff understands the important role of

religious assembly and community gathering facilities for San Jose residents, staff supports the Policy language as currently proposed, which prohibits all Private Community Gathering Facilities in areas designated as *Industrial Park*, *Light Industrial*, and *Heavy Industrial* on the Land Use Diagram, and also near these areas when industrial viability would be compromised. This strategy helps to preserve the integrity of industrial lands and maintains maximum flexibility for industrial uses in these areas as the primary focus. Pastor Oscar Dace has also suggested that religious assembly be considered separately from other Private Community Gathering Facilities such as concert halls or private clubs. However, staff notes that uses within the Private Community Gathering Facility category share a defining characteristic of bringing groups of people together. The activities of groups of people can result in land use incompatibilities, regardless of their purpose for congregating; therefore, staff recommends that religious assembly uses be considered in conjunction with all Private Community Gathering Facility uses.

The Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Service Area boundary establish the maximum extent of urban development and the extent of the provision of urban services in San Jose, respectively. The *Greenline / Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Service Area Policies* further many aspects of the Vision, including the Environmental Leadership, Quality Education & Services, Healthy Neighborhoods, and Interconnected City elements. The *Greenline / Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Service Area Policies* work in concert with many other goals and policies in this Plan, such as those in the Hillside & Rural Areas Design and the Fiscal sections.

g) Community Safety – Emergency Management, Police and Fire, Code Enforcement (*Consent*)

The *Community Safety Policies* include policies related to the mitigation of naturally occurring hazards and address the delivery of public services related to law enforcement, fire, and emergency management, specifically Police, Fire, and Code Enforcement protection and services. These policies also address how the City will respond to and minimize the risk of injury, loss of life, property damage, and community disruption in seismic, geologic/soil, flood, or wildfire events. The *Community Safety Policies* also address the storage and transport of hazardous materials and community protection in the event of exposure to hazardous materials, as well as issues regarding land use compatibility in the vicinity of San Jose's airports.

h) Economic Development

The Task Force has previously discussed the draft *Economic Development Policies* at their meetings on January 11, 2010, February 8, 2010, and May 20, 2010. In response to Task Force concerns that several topics were not land-use related, some policies have been deleted. Also in response to Task Force comments, a new goal and related policies have been drafted to address the desire for broad economic prosperity throughout San Jose's diverse communities.

i) General Plan Implementation (Plan Horizons, Annual Review, and Village Planning)

In response to Task Force comments, staff has revised the draft *Implementation Policies* to clarify the factors the City Council would evaluate to determine whether it is appropriate to move into the next Plan growth Horizon (see Policy IP-3.5(3)). Staff incorporated Task Force comments by indicating that while up to four General Plan review hearings are allowed by State law, only one General Plan Amendment hearing cycle should be held each year in San Jose. Staff also clarified language to highlight that once a geographic area is opened for residential development as part of a growth Horizon, the full amount of planned housing capacity for that area is available for development once a

Village Plan is approved, although staff has shown a “planned” distribution of some capacity into future horizons as more likely.

### *Plan Horizons*

At the June 7, 2010 meeting, the Task Force continued their discussion of phasing or Plan Horizon concepts and asked staff to further consider implementation tools to provide more flexibility for different residential Growth Areas to be included within the first Horizon, while also more strictly limiting the total amount of residential development that can occur within the first and each subsequent Horizon. The approach proposed by staff at the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting built upon prior Task Force and staff work, including the discussion of phasing concepts that took place at the Task Force meetings on March 8, March 22, April 12, and April 26, 2010. As part of the Task Force recommendation for a Preferred Land Use Scenario, as communicated to the City Council for the April 20, 2010 Council meeting, the Task Force endorsed the following concepts:

- Change the Land Use / Transportation Diagram over time (by Horizon) to facilitate coordinated planning and community engagement in advance of residential development projects.
- Guide development to priority Growth Areas to best utilize and support existing infrastructure investments, minimize environmental impacts, and achieve other goals.
- Conduct periodic Major Reviews of the City’s progress toward achievement of economic, environmental, fiscal and other goals.
- Complete Village Plans prior to residential development within Village areas.

These concepts were communicated to the City Council in a supplemental memorandum:

[http://www.sanjoseca.gov/clerk/Agenda/20100420/20100420\\_0401sup.pdf](http://www.sanjoseca.gov/clerk/Agenda/20100420/20100420_0401sup.pdf)

The memorandum to the Council also reiterated that the Growth Area strategy is based on the “conversion” of existing employment lands to residential mixed-use development. Because most of San Jose’s land area is already developed with single-family neighborhoods which the City intends to preserve, the conversion of employment lands, with a focus on low-density commercial sites, is a viable strategy for adding residential growth capacity. Accordingly, most Village area properties under the current San Jose 2020 General Plan are not planned for residential use, but rather are designated for commercial uses, and have limited residential development potential. The proposed Land Use / Transportation Diagram and Horizon strategy would make portions of these areas available over time for residential use.

With a Plan that identifies which Village areas should be a priority for conversion from commercial to residential mixed-use development, the City can be strategic to direct new residential growth to areas where that growth will best make use of existing infrastructure; to implement infrastructure expansions where they are needed; to focus growth in areas with the greatest transit access; and to achieve other Envision goals. Collectively, the new Growth Areas provide growth capacity for approximately 60,000 dwelling units, which could represent more than 20 years of residential construction activity. It is important to concentrate this activity into a targeted subset of Growth Areas to enable the cohesive development of a Village with the desired characteristics. Identifying priority Growth Areas will also enable the Village Planning process to proceed for those targeted areas ahead of, or concurrent with, their development.

### *Dwelling Unit “Cap” Phasing*

In contrast, a phasing plan based on dwelling unit caps for each phase, rather than based on geographic locations, would not identify which Growth Areas should be given priority for implementation, would not focus new growth into Growth Areas to better implement the Village concept and would not facilitate the advance preparation of Village plans. Because a dwelling unit cap would also need to be maintained at a level of dwelling units high enough to provide adequate capacity to comply with the State Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements, it would not likely actually constrain residential construction activity.

### *Geographic-Based Horizons*

Two documents provided in the Task Force packet for the June 28, 2010 meeting further illustrate the proposed geographic-based Horizon strategy. The Table, “*Residential Planned Yield by Horizons*”, identifies the amount of housing that is expected to be produced through full utilization of residential Growth Areas included within each Plan Horizon. This amount is based on the area of land available for residential mixed-use projects within each Village area and the targeted average densities for those new residential projects. The Land Use / Transportation Diagram identifies for each property an allowable range of density for new development so that projects may be developed at a different density range than the targeted average density indicated in the Table. The Task Force was previously provided with a table that indicated the projected yield of each Growth Area over time, based on the assumption that Growth Areas with a large amount of residential capacity would take multiple Horizons to fully implement to buildout. In contrast, this new Table indicates the number of units expected for full build-out of each Growth Area regardless of timeframe. The Task Force packet also includes a Map illustrating the location of each of the Growth Areas, color-coded by the Horizon (1–5) in which they would be made available.

### *Implementation*

The Task Force extensively discussed the draft *Implementation Policies* at their June 7, 2010 meeting. Some Task Force members expressed concern that the proposed draft *Implementation Policies* would be too strict in limiting housing development, specifically with regards to the requirement for a Village Plan in advance of allowing any substantial residential development in the Villages and Corridors. The Task Force should recall that the requirement for approval of a Village Plan in advance of new housing development was endorsed by the Task Force in a motion on April 12, 2010. To reaffirm, staff and the Task Force have endorsed the approach of requiring a Village Plan in advance of substantial residential development in Villages to ensure coordinated planning. The Village Plans will:

- Allow identification of appropriate sites and densities for residential uses in order to achieve the full amount of planned residential growth in each Village and Corridor;
- Identify the most appropriate locations for parks, streets, pedestrian connections to transit, community centers, libraries, and other necessary infrastructure, at times when these facilities have the widest range of choices for appropriate locations, rather than having to avoid locations that have already been developed with residential uses;
- Be developed quickly, in coordination with the community and other stakeholders; and
- Streamline the development review process by providing a clear set of development standards for each Village for future developers and applicants to follow.

Because most of the sites in the Update's Villages and Corridors currently have commercial designations, a General Plan Amendment would currently be required to develop residential uses on the properties. The Village Planning process, intended to be a 4 to 6 month, charrette-type process, would typically be completed within the timeframe of a General Plan Amendment, which should facilitate new residential or mixed-use in the Village and Corridor properties where there is active developer or private investment interest. As noted in the Overview Memo for Task Force Meeting #41 (June 7, 2010), approximately 41,000 housing units could be developed without approval of a Village Plan and would not be subject to phasing requirements, including the 21,000 already-entitled housing units and 20,000 units on sites within the Downtown, Specific Plan areas or on vacant lands located throughout the City. For all of these reasons, staff urges the Task Force to reaffirm endorsement of the Village Plan requirement in advance of new residential development in Villages and Corridors. The proposed draft *Implementation Policies* retain the prerequisite for Village Plans in advance of housing development in the Village and Corridors growth areas.

### **Agenda Item 5 – Community Input**

Members of the community will be provided with an opportunity to address the Task Force and provide input on the Agenda discussion items.

### **Agenda Item 6 – Task Force Vote on Recommendations**

Following Community Input, the Task Force will be asked to propose and vote on a recommendation regarding each of the proposed draft Goals, Policies, and Implementation Actions presented. Staff strongly encourages the Task Force to take action on the full range of Policies agendaized for the June 28, 2010 meeting.

### **Reading / Resource Materials**

Reading and Resource materials for the Task Force are available on the Envision website. Reading/Resource materials are organized by topic:

#### Arts & Culture

- [Draft San Jose's Cultural Vision Plan - Executive Summary March 2010](#)

#### Education

- [Local Governments and Schools: A Community Oriented Approach](#)
- [Article: School District Tests a Creative Strategy](#)
- [Vibrant Neighborhoods, Successful Schools](#)
- [Article: America's K-12 Education Strategy](#)
- [The Mechanics of City-School Initiatives: Transforming Neighborhoods of Distress & Despair into Neighborhoods of Choice & Promise](#)
- [Smart Schools, Smart Growth: Investing in Education Facilities and Stronger Communities](#)

#### Infrastructure

- [City of Santa Clara 2010 Draft General Plan Public Facilities and Services Goals and Policies](#)

- San Jose Zero Waste Infrastructure Assessment
- San Jose-Santa Clara WPCP Infrastructure Condition Assessment
- City of Sacramento General Plan Utilities Goals and Policies
- Green Architecture - Rana Creek Living Architecture

#### Community Safety

- City of Sunnyvale General Plan Law Enforcement and Fire Services Goals, Policies and Action Items
- City of Sacramento General Plan Public Health and Safety Goals and Policies
- City of San Diego General Plan Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element

### **Task Force Correspondence**

Task Force member Dave Fadness submitted comments on the *Circulation, VMT Reduction, Scenic Routes, Hillside/Rural Areas, Libraries, Implementation, and Fiscal Policies*.

Task Force member Pastor Oscar Dace spoke to staff on June 22, 2010 to provide input into the proposed Land Use Diagram and the proposed *Private Community Gathering Facilities Policies*. Some of Pastor Dace's specific comments were raised earlier in this memo.

Task Force member comments are available online, and hard copies will be distributed to the Task Force.

### **Public Correspondence**

Four new public correspondence items are posted on the Envision website, and two additional items are posted that the Task Force has previously received.

Two new public correspondence letters address the location of Village Overlays and their potential impact to historic residences, with one specifically raising concerns regarding the boundary of the East Santa Clara Street Village Overlay designation on the draft Land Use Plan. The Village Overlay boundaries as depicted on the draft Diagram include some established residential neighborhoods with the intent that these neighborhood areas should be a part of the Village Planning process, but not to identify them as sites for new growth. Accordingly, these properties are designated "*Residential Neighborhood*" rather than "*Village*" on the Diagram with the intent of preserving the existing structures, density and character of those areas. Staff can work with the Task Force to continue to refine the visual representation of the planned land uses on the Diagram so as to address this concern, as well as other areas where the Diagram might not yet effectively communicate the Envision concepts.

The third piece of public correspondence relates to the proposed Land Use Diagram designations for VTA-owned properties. Staff reviewed the VTA list of proposed changes to the draft Land Use Diagram for properties owned by the VTA. To the extent that the proposed changes were consistent with City Council policy and direction from the Envision Task Force, changes were made to the draft Diagram.

The fourth letter addresses the topic of post-oil preparedness of major U.S. cities.

The other two items posted online under public correspondence were distributed as hard copies to the Task Force at their June 7, 2010 meeting. Any additional correspondence received before noon on the day of the meeting will be distributed in hard copy to Task Force members and the public.

### **Announcements**

Task Force members were provided with a survey at the May 17<sup>th</sup> as an opportunity to provide feedback on the Envision process and the quality of staff work. If you have not done so already, please consider completing the survey and deliver it to staff by the end of this Task Force meeting. The survey responses will be kept anonymous.

At the May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, staff provided Task Force members with a copy of the San Jose / Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (Plant) Master Planning Workbook which offers an opportunity for Task Force members to comment on the land use scenario alternatives being considered for the master planning of the Plant. The Plant Master Planning process provides an opportunity to comment on the alternatives through June 30, 2010.

### **Next Meetings**

The Envision Task Force will have a well deserved break from meeting during July and August.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 13, 2010. This meeting has been added to the Work Plan in order to provide an opportunity for the Task Force to discuss case studies of Village type developments and individual development projects that could be part of the implementation of a Village plan.

If you have any questions, please contact either myself or Susan Walton. I can be reached by phone at (408) 535-7893 or by email at: [andrew.crabtree@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:andrew.crabtree@sanjoseca.gov). Susan can be reached by phone at (408) 535-7847 or by email at: [susan.walton@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:susan.walton@sanjoseca.gov).

Andrew Crabtree  
Envision San José 2040