

Attachment F

Summary of Task Force Recommendations as of 11/12/2020

Recommendations	Vote
<p><i>Urban Village Modifications:</i></p> <p>The Task Force recommends to staff the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Eliminate Evergreen Village 2) Eliminate Capitol Ave./Foxdale urban village 3) Make no change to the Race Street urban village boundary for the Reed & Graham site (as was recommended by staff to exclude from the UV boundary). 	<p>12/18/2019</p> <p>Approved (37 – 1)</p>
<p>The Task Force recommends to staff to eliminate the Urban Village Residential Pool Policy (General Plan Policy IP-2.11)</p>	<p>12/18/2019</p> <p>Approved unanimously (38 – 0)</p>
<p><i>Urban Village Development (General Plan Policy IP-5.5)</i></p> <p>The Task Force recommends the following text amendment to Policy IP-5.5 to staff:</p> <p>Employ the Urban Village Planning process to plan land uses that include adequate capacity for the full amount of planned job and housing growth, including identification of optimal sites for new retail development and careful consideration of appropriate minimum and maximum densities for residential and employment uses to ensure that the Urban Village Area will provide sufficient capacity to support the full amount of planned job growth under this Envision Plan. The Urban Village Plan should be consistent with the following objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Urban Village planning process is not a mechanism to convert employment lands to non-employment uses. 2. Other City policies such as raising revenues, for example which could occur through the conversion of employment lands to non-employment uses shall not take precedent over the jobs first principle. 3. The General Plan’s jobs first principles apply to Urban Villages and that residential conversions are not allowed to proceed ahead of the job creation that is necessary to balance the residential elements of the Village Plan. This policy means that jobs and housing can move together on a case by case basis. 	<p>12/18/2019</p> <p>Approved unanimously (38 – 0)</p>
<p><i>Signature Project Policy (Urban Village Planning Implementation Policy IP-5.10)</i></p> <p>The Task Force’s recommendations on the Signature Project Policy was passed with two motions.</p>	<p>12/18/2019</p> <p>Approved unanimously (38 – 0)</p>

Recommendations	Vote
<p><u>Motion #1</u></p> <p>The Task Force recommends to staff that the Signature Project Policy allows residential and mixed-use Signature Projects in an Urban Village to proceed in advance of preparation of an Urban Village Plan if it meets the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compatibility: Located on a site with an Urban Village, residential, or commercial land use designation. • Commercial Density: Provide the planned average job-density in the Urban Village. • Housing Density: Provide a minimum residential density of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neighborhood Village: 30 DU/AC ○ Local Transit Village: 55 DU/AC ○ Commercial Corridor and Center Village: 55 DU/AC ○ Regional Transit Urban Village: 75 DU/AC • Location: Located on a corner lot, or an interior parcel at minimum of 1.5 acres with a minimum of 100 feet of street frontage. A signature project shall not result in the creation of remnant parcels of less than one acre. • Open Space: Includes either public parkland or publicly-accessible plazas or open space areas. If providing publicly-accessible plazas or open space areas, the minimum sizes are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neighborhood Village: 2,000 square feet ○ Local Transit Village: 5,000 square feet ○ Commercial Corridor and Center Village: 5,000 square feet ○ Regional Transit Urban Village: 10,000 square feet • Pedestrian Orientation and Design: Compliance with the following City policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Standards of the Citywide Design Guidelines ○ Complete Streets Design Guidelines 	
<p><i>Signature Project Policy (Urban Village Planning Implementation Policy IP-5.10)</i></p> <p><u>Motion #2</u></p> <p>The Task Force recommends the following community outreach and affordable housing conditions for Signature Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Outreach: Create a tailored community engagement strategy to optimize broad and diverse stakeholder engagement in the community where the project is located to better collect feedback of 	<p>1/30/2020</p> <p>Approved (28 – 9)</p>

Recommendations	Vote																
<p>the design and quality of the project. The community engagement strategy must adhere to and include the policies outlined under General Plan Goal CE-1 Active Community Engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable Housing commercial space reduction incentive: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction or elimination of commercial requirements as an incentive for affordable housing for Signature Projects and in all urban villages. 2. Conduct a feasibility analysis using the methodology in Option 1 as a starting point. The feasibility analysis will include coordinating with stakeholders like affordable housing developer and consider the letters to Task Force with alternative options to look at square footages versus percentages. 3. This Task Force recommendation will be expedited to City Council. <p>Option 1 referenced in the motion states:</p> <p>Signature Projects that desire to take advantage of the commercial requirement reductions would first need to meet their IHO requirements by providing 15% of their total units as affordable on site. The Project then could reduce their commercial space requirement by providing additional affordable housing on-site as outlined below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="204 1083 1141 1556"> <thead> <tr> <th>*Percentage of On-Site Affordable Units</th> <th>Percentage Reduction in Required Commercial Space</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>20%</td><td>15%</td></tr> <tr><td>25%</td><td>20%</td></tr> <tr><td>30%</td><td>25%</td></tr> <tr><td>35%</td><td>30%</td></tr> <tr><td>40%</td><td>35%</td></tr> <tr><td>45%</td><td>40%</td></tr> <tr><td>50%</td><td>45%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>*The ratio and percentages in Option 1 will be used as a starting point for the feasibility analysis.</i></p>	*Percentage of On-Site Affordable Units	Percentage Reduction in Required Commercial Space	20%	15%	25%	20%	30%	25%	35%	30%	40%	35%	45%	40%	50%	45%	
*Percentage of On-Site Affordable Units	Percentage Reduction in Required Commercial Space																
20%	15%																
25%	20%																
30%	25%																
35%	30%																
40%	35%																
45%	40%																
50%	45%																
<p>The Task Force recommends to staff to eliminate Urban Village Horizons</p>	<p>1/30/2020 Approved unanimously (37 – 0)</p>																

Recommendations	Vote
<p><i>Urban Village Planning Prioritization (General Plan Policy IP-2.10)</i></p> <p>The Task Force recommends the following text amendment to Policy IP-2.10 to staff:</p> <p>Open Horizons for development in planned phases <u>Prioritize the preparation of Urban Village plans</u> to give priority for new residential growth to occur in areas proximate to Downtown, <u>or</u> with access to existing and planned transit facilities, and or <u>adequate infrastructure to support intensification, and or</u> proximate to other Growth Areas to contribute to the City’s urban form. <u>Growth Areas with high market demand shall also be prioritized to ensure that development follows the community’s vision for the future.</u></p>	<p>1/30/2020</p> <p>Approved unanimously (37 – 0)</p>
<p><i>100% Affordable Housing (General Plan Policy IP-5.12)</i></p> <p>Recommend the removal of commercial requirements and the following text amendment to Policy IP-5.12 to staff:</p> <p>Residential projects that are 100% affordable deed restricted by a public entity for a period not less than 55 years to low income residents (earning 80% or less of the Area Median Income), can proceed within an Urban Village ahead of a Growth Horizon, or in a Village in a current Horizon that does not have a Council approved Plan regardless of Growth Horizon or a Council Approved Plan, if the project meets the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project does not result in more than 25% of the total residential capacity of a given Urban Village being developed with affordable housing ahead of that Village’s Growth Horizon. For Villages with less than a total housing capacity of 500 units, up to 125 affordable units could be developed, however the total number of affordable units cannot exceed the total planned housing capacity of the given Village. 2.<u>1.</u> The development is consistent with the <u>goals, policies, and land use designation</u> of the Urban Village Plan for a given Village, if one has been approved by the City Council. 3. Development that demolishes and does not adaptively reuse existing commercial buildings should substantially replace of the existing commercial square footage. 4.<u>2.</u> The project is not located on identified key employment opportunity sites, which are sites generally 2 acres or larger, located at major intersections and for which there is anticipated market demand for commercial uses within the next 10 to 15 years. 	<p>1/30/2020</p> <p>Approved (36 – 1)</p>

Recommendations	Vote
<p style="color: red; text-align: center;">5. Affordable housing projects built in Villages under this policy would not pull from the residential Pool capacity.</p>	
<p>The Task Force recommends to staff to establish a new Regional Transit Urban Village called the Capitol Caltrain Station Area</p>	<p>2/27/2020 Approved (32 - 1 - 1; 1 abstention)</p>
<p>The Task Force recommends to staff to convert the Story Road Employment Area Growth Area to an Urban Village with a residential capacity of 1,000 residential units and recommend that the Story Road Urban Village be considered as potential area for the Supporting Small Business Program for small business anti-displacement efforts.</p>	<p>2/27/2020 Approved (33 - 0 - 1; 1 abstention)</p>
<p><i>Residential Uses in Neighborhood Business Districts (NBDs)</i></p> <p>The Task Force recommends the following to staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Identify Willow Street, North 13th Street, Willow Glen, and Japantown (Taylor Street only) NBDs as Growth Areas in Appendix 5 of the General Plan. 2) Reallocate a 600-unit residential capacity pool from urban villages to the four NBDs. 3) Approve the following policy framework with direction to staff to explore revising the 100% replacement of commercial for flexibility based on different characteristics of each NBD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the existing Neighborhood Business District overlay to allow residential uses in the Japantown (Taylor Street only), North 13th Street, Willow Glen, and Willow Street Neighborhood Business Districts. New residential or residential-mixed use developments shall: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replace 100% of the existing amount of commercial or industrial space on site, with commercial square footage. Where commercial or industrial uses do not currently exist, no commercial space is required unless the property is bounded by (shares a property line) with existing employment uses that also front the primary neighborhood businesses street (e.g. Lincoln Avenue, Willow Street, Taylor Street or 13th Street). In these location, a residential project would need to provide ground floor commercial space to create continuity of the commercial frontage along the street; 2. Maximum residential densities and building height limits in each NBDs to be determined through a community outreach process; 3. New development is allowed to keep its existing on-site density and height if it is higher than the maximums established in this policy; 4. Comply with City Design Guidelines; and 5. Adaptively reuse any historic structures that are on a property. 	<p>2/27/2020 Approved (27 - 4 - 3; 3 abstentions)</p>

Recommendations	Vote
4) Include policy language for compliance to future anti-displacement strategies that result from the Small Business Alum Rock Pilot Program.	
<p data-bbox="203 338 505 369"><i>General Plan Policy H-2.9</i></p> <p data-bbox="203 390 805 422">The Task Force recommends the following to staff:</p> <ul data-bbox="253 443 1138 1703" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="253 443 1138 506">• Amend Policy H-2.9 to eliminate the commercial space requirement as shown in strikeout/<u>underline</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="342 527 1138 737">To increase the supply of affordable housing, one hundred percent deed restricted affordable housing developments would be allowed on sites outside of the existing Growth Areas on properties with a Mixed Use Commercial or Neighborhood/Community Commercial land use designation if the development meets the following criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="342 758 699 789">1. The site is 1.5 acre or less. <li data-bbox="342 810 797 842">2. The site is vacant or underutilized. <li data-bbox="342 863 1122 926">3. The site has adjacent properties with a residential General Plan Land Use / Transportation Diagram designation on at least one side and the development would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. <li data-bbox="342 1073 1122 1136">4. The development would not impact the viability of surrounding commercial or industrial properties or businesses. <li data-bbox="342 1157 1073 1188">5. The site is located within a ½-mile of an existing transit line. <li data-bbox="342 1209 1122 1272">6. The development integrates commercial uses that support the affordable housing project and/or the surrounding neighborhood. <li data-bbox="342 1293 1105 1398"><u>6.</u> Development on properties that contain structures that are on, or are eligible for inclusion on the City of San José’s Historic Resources Inventory should adaptively reuse these structures. <li data-bbox="253 1419 1105 1482">• Encourage staff to bring forth clear guidelines to what constitutes as “underutilized” in Policy H-2.9]; <li data-bbox="253 1503 1089 1566">• Consider a citywide policy that does not put an obligation on 100% affordable housing developers to develop commercial space; and <li data-bbox="253 1587 1122 1703">• Bring policy changes to City Council earlier than the timeline set for all the other General Plan 4-Year Review recommendations to go to City Council, which is anticipated for Spring 2021. 	<p data-bbox="1166 338 1292 369">6/25/2020</p> <p data-bbox="1166 390 1373 422">Approved (35 - 1)</p>

Recommendations	Vote
<p><i>Opportunity Housing</i></p> <p>The Task Force’s recommendations on Opportunity Housing was passed with two motions.</p> <p><u>Motion #1</u></p> <p>The Task Force recommends the following to staff:</p> <p>Explore allowing up to four units on parcels with a Residential Neighborhood land use designation citywide. Should City Council direct staff to further explore Opportunity Housing, the following actions will need to be initiated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct a citywide community engagement effort. 2. Explore creating an affordable housing incentive to encourage inclusion of units at affordable or moderately-priced levels in Opportunity Housing. 3. Find an approach that would allow Opportunity Housing while also minimizing displacement risk. 4. Explore strategies to preserve historic areas and properties while also allowing Opportunity Housing. 5. Update City policies and ordinances to allow Opportunity Housing <p>The parameters of each action identified above is described in the August 20, 2020 Task Force meeting overview memo, pages one and two.</p>	<p>8/20/2020</p> <p>Approved (28 - 6)</p>
<p><i>Opportunity Housing</i></p> <p><u>Motion #2</u></p> <p>The Task Force recommends to staff that during the period of study [for Opportunity Housing] that staff prioritizes Urban Village implementation.</p>	<p>8/20/2020</p> <p>Approved (27 - 6 – 1; 1 abstention)</p>
<p><i>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Policies</i></p> <p>The Task Force recommends the following changes to the General Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move forward with implementation of General Plan Tier II VMT actions and eliminate the tiered structure of VMT reduction actions. • Amend the General Plan VMT reduction goals to align with the VMT reduction goals recommended by Climate Smart as shown in the table below. 	<p>9/21/2020</p> <p>Approved (27 - 1)</p>

Proposed Amendments to General Plan VMT Reduction Goals

Year	2017	2030 Goal (Proposed New)	2040 Goal (Proposed Removal)	2040 Goal (Proposed Replacement)
% Reduction from 2017 level	-	20%	38%	45%
Citywide VMT per service population	14.1	11.1	8.8	8.0

- Amend the General Plan mode split goals to align with Climate Smart and to evaluate all trip purposes as opposed to focusing only on work trips. The table below shows the proposed changes to the mode split goals in the General Plan.

Proposed Amendments to General Plan Mode Split Goals

Mode	2019	2030 Goal All Trips (Proposed New)	2040 Goal Commute Trips (Proposed Removal)	2040 Goal All Trips (Proposed Replacement)
Drive Alone	80%	≤ 45%	≤ 40%	≤ 25%
Shared Mobility/ Carpool	12%	≥ 25%	≥ 10%	≥ 25%
Transit	5%	≥ 10%	≥ 20%	≥ 20%
Bicycle	< 2%	≥ 10%	≥ 15%	≥ 15%
Walk	< 2%	≥ 10%	≥ 15%	≥ 15%

- Amend the General Plan to include additional actions to achieve the proposed updated VMT reduction and mode split goals and further support achievement of the greenhouse gas reduction goals of Climate Smart San José. These additional actions include:
 - Explore development of transportation management associations (TMA) in transit-oriented developments, mixed-

Recommendations	Vote
<p>use developments, developments within Urban Villages, and across the City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement transportation focused actions identified in the City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy and Climate Smart San José Plan. ○ Develop, implement, and regularly update, as needed, a citywide pedestrian plan. ○ Develop a citywide transportation plan that identifies, prioritizes, and monitors the City’s near-term transportation investments. ○ Develop area transportation plans that identify, prioritize, and monitor long-term transportation projects and programs in the City’s Growth Areas in alignment with General Plan goals and policies. ○ Explore development of a regional VMT bank and exchange program in which development mitigation contributions can be pooled to pay for more effective VMT reduction strategies that would not be feasible for individual projects to implement. ○ Develop and implement strategies to increase shared mobility options. ○ Develop and implement strategies to rapidly improve the operations of and expand transit options throughout the City. This includes the development of new routes services by rail, bus, and new transit technologies. ○ Adopt a transit first policy that prioritizes transit travel speeds over other vehicles on the road in terms of signal operations and roadway allocation. In particular, give transit services pre-emptive signal priority as a default. Also, give transit its own lanes and right of ways where ever possible. ○ Develop strategies to ensure that the development and implementation of autonomous vehicle technology is aligned with land use and transit-priority policies that foster sustainable, affordable, and efficient modes. ○ Develop regulations to promote the safe and responsible operation of micro-mobility such as shared bikes, e-scooters, and e-bikes. 	

Recommendations	Vote
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement Vision Zero strategies to eliminate all traffic fatalities, significantly reduce severe injury crashes, and create safe and comfortable walk and bike environments. ○ Develop strategies to promote the continuation of remote working after the end of the COVID-19 pandemic. ● Along with amendments to the General Plan, the Task Force directed staff to analyze the City’s Vehicle Miles Travelled policies with the following considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) New technologies and their effect on VMT; 2) The changing face of work and their effect on VMT; 3) The jobs/housing imbalance; 4) Equity among communities; 5) Open space and feasibility and metric issues; and 6) Including subcontractors as part of Transportation Demand Management policies. 	
<p><i>Long-Term Future of Coyote Valley</i></p> <p>The Task Force recommends the following actions pertaining to the long-term future of Coyote Valley to staff:</p> <p><u>North Coyote Valley</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reallocate all 35,000 jobs from North Coyote Valley, specifically reallocate 30,000 jobs to the Downtown Growth Area and evaluate, in conjunction with the Alviso Community, the possibility of reallocating 5,000 jobs to the Alviso Master Plan Employment Lands Growth Area. 2. Amend the General Plan text to remove North Coyote Valley as an Employment Lands Growth Area from the General Plan. 3. Change the land use designations of properties in North Coyote that have been purchased by the City and POST/OSA for preservation from Industrial Park to Open Space, Parklands and Habitat. 4. Change the land use designations of remaining properties in North Coyote that have not already been developed for industrial uses from Industrial Park to Agriculture, except for the area occupied by the Gavilan College Coyote Valley Center (South Bay Regional Public Safety Training Consortium), which would be changed from Industrial Park to Public/Quasi-Public. These properties would also be rezoned as needed to align with the appropriate General Plan land use designations. 	<p>10/29/2020</p> <p>Approved (26 -1 - 4; 4 abstentions)</p>

Recommendations	Vote
<p>5. Explore a credits program in parallel with proposed land use designation changes to support further conservation actions in Coyote Valley and facilitate development in urbanized areas of San Jose.</p> <p>6. Add an action item to the General Plan to move the Urban Service Area boundary north as soon as possible consistent with the proposed land use changes in North Coyote Valley. Properties proposed to retain an urban land use designation (i.e., Industrial Park and Public/Quasi-Public) should stay within the Urban Service Area.</p> <p>7. Add an Action Item to the General Plan to consider creating an overlay that would restrict office buildings as an allowable use in certain Industrial Park and/or Combined Industrial Commercial designated areas, or redesignate some areas from IP and/or CIC to Light Industrial to preserve and support existing industrial businesses.</p> <p>8. Add an Action Item to the General Plan to explore creating an industrial overlay allowing for new office construction only if the office building includes some manufacturing or logistics space.</p>	
<p><u>Mid- and South Coyote Valley</u></p> <p>9. Amend the General Plan to remove the Mid-Coyote Valley Urban Reserve designation and designate properties in Mid-Coyote Valley to either Agriculture, Private Recreation, Public/Quasi-Public, or Combined Industrial Commercial. Properties in Mid-Coyote Valley within the City’s jurisdictional boundary would also be rezoned as needed to align with the appropriate General Plan land use designations.</p> <p>10. Create and apply a new Coyote Valley Agriculture Overlay that increases the minimum lot size from 20-acres to 40-acres on certain properties (see Attachment G) with an existing or proposed Agriculture land use designation that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Within North, Mid- and South Coyote Valley and are inside the City’s jurisdictional boundary; and b. Within Mid- and South Coyote Valley that are outside of the City’s jurisdictional boundary and are zoned <i>Exclusive Agriculture</i> under the County’s Zoning Ordinance, which sets a minimum lot size of 40-acres (A-40ac). <p>Additionally the Task Force recommends the City request the County to impose protections in Coyote Valley that match or exceeds the City’s protections.</p>	

Recommendations	Vote
<p data-bbox="203 247 831 279"><i>Redistribution of Planned Growth (Housing and Jobs)</i></p> <p data-bbox="203 300 807 331">The Task Force recommends the following to staff:</p> <ul data-bbox="251 352 1138 861" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="251 352 1138 489">• Amend Appendix 5 (Planned Job Capacity and Housing Growth Areas by Horizon table) of the General Plan to reallocate planned residential units and jobs as shown in Tables 1 and 2, and detailed in Attachment J of the October 29, 2020 Task Force meeting overview memo. <li data-bbox="251 510 1138 646">• Amend the General Plan to add a policy to allow planned residential units within Neighborhood Urban Villages to be captured in a pool and to be reflected in Appendix 5 – Planned Job Capacity and Housing Growth Areas by Horizon table. <li data-bbox="251 667 1138 741">• With every [General Plan] 4-Year Review, provide the opportunity to explore housing; and <li data-bbox="251 762 1138 861">• Specifically evaluate, in conjunction with the Alviso Community, the possibility of reallocating 5,000 jobs to Alviso Master Plan Employment Lands Growth Area. 	<p data-bbox="1166 247 1312 279">10/29/2020</p> <p data-bbox="1166 300 1414 363">Approved (29 - 1 - 6; 6 abstentions)</p>