From: Robert Reese

To: GeneralPlanStaff; Hughey, Rosalynn; Brilliot, Michael; Hart, Jared; Rivera, Robert; KieuLanPham@sanjoseca.gov
Cc: Sandra Randles; Bonnie Mace; Jim Zito; Daniel Reyes; Wesley Lee; John Goldstein; Arenas, Sylvia; Patrick

**McGarrity** 

Subject: GP 4-Yr Review - D8 Community Round Table - Evergreen- East Hills Development Policy & Transportation

Policies

**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2020 11:33:21 AM

[External Email]

Hello 2040 General Plan Review Planning Team and Task Force Members!

The District 8 Community Round Table (D8CRT) appreciates the opportunities the 2040 GPTF and Planning Staff have created for community members to be significantly engaged with the efforts of the 2040 GPTF.

The D8CRT has some ideas and issues that we suggest Planning consider for research, discussion, analyses and reporting metrics in the Planning Recommendation to the 2040 GPTF on the Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy & Transportation Policies (EEHDP) and the Vehicle Miles Traveled Tier II (VMT) Policies for the March 26 Meeting as follows:

1. In Planning's introduction of those areas of D5, D7 and D8 which are subject to the EEHDP we request that Planning include several maps in sufficient detail which show the larger development parcels, their sizes and the Greenline and Urban boundaries.

Some of the sites which should be included in the maps Planning provides are as follows:

- \* Urban Villages
- \* EASTRIDGE/REID-HILLVIEW
- \* PLEASANT HILLS GOLF COURSE 100 acres @ Tully/White
- \* EVERGREEN INDUSTRIAL CAMPUS 320 acres+/- on Yerba Buena Road
- \* 27 aces EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE with General Plan for Neighborhood Community Commercial
- \* RICHMOND and YOUNG RANCHES which total approx 6,000 acres in the Southern Evergreen Valley
- \* Other large potential development site not listed including the ARCADIA site
- 2. Description and analyses of how VMT came to be through the initial State Legislation and the VTA Mapping for Santa Clara County.
- 3. A discussion of how VMT was intended to curtail urban sprawl as the primary goal of the State legislation and VTA Mapping in implementation of VMT for Santa Clara County.
- 4. How is VMT being implemented in the outlying exurban areas whose housing markets are driven by the housing demands of the Bay Area? Is this housing supply source being allowed to continue under VMT or being curtailed? If these areas requested that the State alter the VMT requirements for their areas to allow more urban sprawl how would that effect the Santa Clara County VMT Mapping prepared by VTA?
- 5. What are the total transportation and community benefit capital costs that are currently estimated for the EEHDP? How much of these costs are budgeted?
- 6. What are the total incremental transportation and community benefit capital costs for EEHDP at future build out? What are the source of these incremental capital costs?

- 7. What are the traffic impact fees associated with VMT in the EEHDP areas now and at build out?
- 8. Discuss and analyze SB 330 and 3194 and other State legislation and how they affect land use planning in the EEHDP areas. Does State legislation affect San Jose's ability to implement a comprehensive land use plan for the EEHDP area? Would a "Specific Plan" be allowed?
- 9. Could the permanent open space easement or outright preservation of the RICHMOND and YOUNG RANCHES or other large ranches subject to development interest occur in the context of the trade-offs for the future build out of the EEHDP area in a comprehensive land use plan?
- 10. Is the 2040 GPTF the appropriate place to begin the discussion on extending the Scenic Rural Corridor GP Designation on the entire length of YERBA BUENA easterly from San Felipe Road and continuing along the future extension of to ABORN @ MURILLO? How can this extension of the Scenic Rural Corridor be implemented?
- 11. Please prepare a Map showing the Measure C areas with the 50% affordable housing requirement in the EEHDP areas. How does this Measure C requirement relate to future development and a comprehensive land use plan for the EEHDP?
- 12. Given the nature and extent of the complexity of the research and analyses required of PBCE, Public Works and the City Attorney on the issues involving the EEHDP area, will Planning Staff be considering a Recommendation to the 2040 GPTF and Council that a subsequent Policy Committee of Stakeholders be convened to delve more thoroughly into the EEHDP once the necessary information has been obtained and Planning studies have been completed to provide its findings to Council?

We have included the link to the City Council Meeting which referred the EEHDP Memo to the 2040 GPTF and have provided the link below for you. Its Item 4.2.

https://sanjose.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\_id=52&clip\_id=11117

Some of the takeaways are:

EVERGREEN is just not meant to grow residential however new commercial development, and unique growth opportunities exist for planning residential growth and inhibiting urban sprawl

Is VMT a sufficient constraint?

What are the fees for EEHDP VMT

Be clear with the 2040 GPTF with Information and direction to the 2020 GPTF being as clear as possible.

t would be important for Planning Staff to address these and the other Council comments in the Planning Recommendation Report to the 2040 GPTF.

We are trying to get Planning the info which the D8CRT has requested early on given the tight time frames involved in the 2040 GPTF's efforts.

Would be possible to have the Planning Recommendation Report on the EEHDP available to the community prior to the 1 week timeframe being utilized for the issuance of Planning Recommendation Reports?

Please feel free to reach out if you should have any questions!

Sincerely,

DISTRICT 8 COMMUNITY ROUND TABLE

Jeremy Barousse , President

Robert Reese, Chair and Land Use Committee Members Sandi Randles, Bonnie Mace, Jim Zito, Wes Lee, Daniel Reyes and John Goldstein

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