

**From:** [Michelle Yesney](#)  
**To:** [GeneralPlanStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Reed & Graham  
**Date:** Saturday, November 30, 2019 3:02:48 PM

---

[External Email]

I do not feel that my comments on this subject at the last meeting were particularly clear. Simply eliminating the General Plan land use provision for a "LULU" (locally unwanted land use) is neither productive nor good planning when the land use provides a product essential for both the public and private sectors. Since this property owner is also interested in moving, it would be especially appropriate for the City to consider a more proactive role.

When regulators appeared likely to close down the Newby Island landfill several decades ago, the City of San Jose undertook a substantial study to identify suitable alternative sites for a regional landfill. The result was the designation of several properties within the City's own sphere of influence as "potential landfill sites" (one of which is now Kirby Canyon landfill).

This type of planning effort does not necessarily have to be linked to this particular business, but could meet the need for heavy industrial businesses whose future existence might be threatened by the current trend in industrial businesses (i.e., office-centric light industry).

I understand that although it would/could be a spin-off of a potential amendment to an urban village plan, this type of study may not be within the current Council-directed work plan. It could be proposed for future implementation, however, and I urge staff to consider it.

Michelle Yesney

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.