



SAAG MEETING #8 | Meeting Notes

Date + Time August 29, 2018 | 6-9pm

Location San Jose City Hall, Committee Rooms 118-120

Meeting Objectives

- Update on engagement activities and current development in the Diridon Station Area
- Clarify the group's top Desired Outcomes

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review the Summary Notes of SAAG Meeting #7
3. Engagement Process Updates
4. Diridon Station Area Updates
5. Group Discussion on Desired Outcomes
6. Public Comment
7. Next Steps
8. Adjourn

ATTENDANCE

SAAG Members: 28 of the 38 SAAG members were present at the meeting (*please see the Meeting Minutes posted to the project website for the names of SAAG members that were present*)

City Staff: Kim Walesh – Deputy City Manager; Lee Wilcox – Chief of Staff; Lori Severino – Diridon Engagement Manager; Rosalynn Hughey – Director of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement

Consultant Team: Matt Raimi – Principal (*Raimi+Associates*); Dave Javid - Principal (*Plan to Place*); Leah Chambers – Outreach Specialist (*Plan to Place*)

Public: There were approximately 40 members of the public at the meeting



SUMMARY

On August 29th, 2018 the Diridon Station Area Advisory Committee (SAAG) held its eighth meeting to discuss the Diridon Station Area and the potential project. The primary agenda item was to discuss the group's top Desired Outcomes. The following notes are summarized based on the major agenda items in the order they were presented at the Meeting.

INTRODUCTION

Lee Wilcox kicked-off the meeting and received approval of the previous two meeting minutes. Next, Dave Javid reviewed the meeting agenda and group agreements, then provided an overview of the SAAG's comments made at the previous meeting. There was a comment by a SAAG member that the takeaways from the previous SAAG meeting did not fully characterize the main points of the meeting. Dave responded that the notes summarized the comments made by SAAG members at a high level (not the content of the presentation itself) and a more detailed description of the SAAG discussion was captured in the summary notes posted to the project website.

ENGAGEMENT PROCESS UPDATES

Lori Severino provided an overview of the engagement process efforts to date as well as upcoming events. Below is a summary of the questions and comments from the SAAG following the update.

- Ensure that community engagement is done in an authentic way and involves more people in future events. We want to make sure the process is as inclusive as possible. How will it be done authentically moving forward? How were the previous public meeting advertised? How will you reach those not on email for the upcoming meetings? Can there be funding provided by the City to do more targeted outreach?
 - *Lori responded that the June events were promoted on the [diridonsj.org website](http://diridonsj.org), via social media, and digital flyers distributed to all SAAG members and other community leaders, including City Council and the Neighborhood Commissions. The meeting notification plan will be the same for the September meetings. Lori and Kim Walesh emphasized that staff is relying on SAAG members to help get the word out to their constituents. Staff encourages continued feedback and support by SAAG members to improve the outreach process.*
- What topics will the meetings cover? The meeting notices should clarify whether the Google project or the overall Diridon Station Area is being discussed.
 - *Lori responded that the flier for the September meetings specifically lists "potential Google development" as one of the topics. It is not intended to obscure that as a focus, and staff is open to suggestions on how to make it more clear.*
- The Forums felt too "pro-Google" to some of the participants, and the Mayfair forum did not display cultural competence by having non-Spanish speakers give the presentation in Spanish.
 - *Lee clarified that the presentations were designed to provide general background context and an open forum for comments, without bias. They asked open-ended questions including hopes and fears. The Mayfair presentation was given in Spanish by fluent Spanish speakers – claims otherwise are misinformation.*
- What is the target audience for the Gardner Community Center meeting coming up?

- *Lori responded that there are three meetings happening in September in different neighborhoods to encourage the general public to attend. The Gardner meeting is most likely to attract residents of Downtown, Diridon, and Gardner/North Willow Glen areas.*
- A member of the SAAG voiced support for the engagement process and encouraged fellow members to work more closely with their constituency to get more people out to meetings and plugged into the process.
- How is the public comment being captured and how will it be represented in the comprehensive report?
 - *Lee responded that all comments are being recorded and will be represented in the summaries and documented in the Comprehensive Report.*
- How was the protest from the previous meeting characterized in the notes?
 - *Lee responded that the members of the public were given an opportunity to sit in the Chambers to view and listen to the meeting, and were given speaker cards. Staff recognizes that the room that the SAAG meetings are held in is not ideal, but it is our best option since the meetings need to be videotaped and recorded. Several SAAG members had told Lee that the meeting minutes should focus on the content of SAAG discussions and public comment, not on the protests that occurred in parallel.*

DIRIDON STATION AREA UPDATES

Rosalynn Hughey presented on current development projects in and around the Diridon Station Area and discussed the on-going update to the Design Guidelines. Below is a summary of the questions and comments from the SAAG following the update.

- Where are the current Design Guidelines out of sync with the intended vision for Downtown? *Rosalynn noted that the updated guidelines would promote a high-quality, mixed-use development and enhance the pedestrian experience at the street level. The old guidelines are either silent on these goals or counterproductive.*
- How much development is currently in the pipeline? *Rosalynn noted that is approximately 10,700 additional dwelling units, 33,000 square feet of retail, and 3.4 million square feet of office. Information is available on sjpermits.org.*
- How much residential growth citywide is currently allowed? *Rosalynn noted that the projected growth to 2040 is about 470,000 people that equates to about 120,000 new homes, based on buildout of the General Plan's land use designations.*
- Will the Downtown Design Guidelines look at the compatibility of high density development near existing residential neighborhoods? *Rosalynn noted that it is definitely a consideration, and the guidelines will include transition areas and design principles to ensure a compatible transition.*
- What is the current Downtown Environmental Impact Report (EIR) update evaluating? *Rosalynn responded that it will add short-term capacity for about 10,000 jobs and 4,000 dwelling units. They plan to release the Draft EIR by the end of August and present to the City Council for approval later in the fall.*
- Will the Guadalupe Design Guidelines adopted in 2003 be incorporated into the updated Design Guidelines? *Rosalynn responded that yes, they will be incorporated.*
- The Design Guidelines should consider cultural scale along with human-scale, related to Latino businesses being displaced. Will we evaluate cultural sensitivity and history? *Rosalynn noted that the*

guidelines will highlight identity and history of the City, and a Historic Preservation Officer has been hired to provide input.

- A member of the SAAG voiced concern that the “Destination Diridon” project is a Google project and the City should be clear about that messaging. Another member responded that the Google project has not yet been submitted.
- What is the timing of the historic inventory? *Rosalynn noted that working on both the Guidelines and inventory concurrently, but the inventory will take longer and last through 2019.*
- Why are the Design Guidelines being updated? *Rosalynn responded that the previous guidelines from the 1990’s were limited in their capacity for things like supporting activation at the ground level, addressing issues of scale, and promoting an interesting skyline.*
- Is the City considering policy changes to increase residential development, e.g. parking standards? *Rosalynn responded that yes, that is being considered, following council direction to spur more residential development (e.g., looking at changes to parking standards and reduce barriers).*
- Will there be a reference to equity or affordability in the design guidelines? *Rosalynn noted that information will be housed in corresponding policy documents, as those topics are not typically included on the design guidelines.*

GROUP DISCUSSION ON DESIRED OUTCOMES

Matt Raimi and Dave Javid facilitated an interactive discussion to gauge the general levels of agreement on the SAAG’s top Desired Outcomes, as they were characterized at a high-level by staff and the consultants. Outcomes were generally organized by the Solution Groups topics, although some were separated into subtopics or the applicable geographic scale (Diridon Station Area versus Citywide). Each topic had several outcomes listed on a slide. For each slide, staff asked the SAAG member to hold up cards reflecting their level of agreement with the statements: green for “Agree”, yellow for “Agree with some revision”, or red for “Disagree”. SAAG members could also abstain. Following the balloting on each set of Desired Outcomes, SAAG members explained their suggested revisions. Below is the summary of the SAAG’s inputs.

SAAG questions leading into discussion:

- How will the community’s comments outside of the SAAG meeting be characterized? *Matt responded that staff will summarize and document public comments in the Comprehensive Report.*
- When will the report go to City Council? *Lee noted that it will go to the Council in an information memo after the last SAAG meeting. It won’t go to Council for a formal acceptance of the report.*
- What is the MOU about process and what topics will be covered? *Kim Walesh referred to the FAQ document completed last month, which was emailed to the SAAG and is available on the project website.*

Land Use – 1 red, 9 yellow, 15 green, 3 abstention

- Desired Outcomes should be separated into DSAP and City-wide
- Preference should be given for Low and Very-Low housing
- Include displacement in housing and business
- Use “Optimize” instead of “maximize”
- Include the notion of a “sense of place”
- Include east-west connections

- Include Value capture for up-zoning

Design – 0 red, 4 yellow, 22 green, 2 abstentions

- Add “cultural and historic”, honor Chicano history
- In the human-scale outcome, add “for people of all abilities”
- Recognize the conflict between goals for maximizing density and for creating an interesting skyline
- Add “interaction with street”
- Add “Allow signs to be used as art”

Public Spaces – 0 red, 6 yellow, 19 green, 3 abstentions

- Add “Development should face the creek”
- Add “Enhance riparian habitat along creeks and river”
- Add “bathrooms provided in public spaces”
- Add “3 Creeks Trail” to creek linkage outcome
- Add urban agriculture and vertical activation of space
- Reflect cultural spaces

Transportation– 0 red, 8 yellow, 17 green, 3 abstentions

- Add outcome to “Provide for future transit capacity”
- Emphasize that the DSA should “maximize” non-auto traffic
- Emphasize transit connectedness
- With respect to the Diridon Integrated Station Concept (DISC), emphasize first- and last-mile connections
- Integrate Caltrain/VTA/BART at Diridon

Parking– 0 red, 8 yellow, 15 green, 5 abstentions

- Add “Proactively” manage parking
- Recognize the ongoing need for parking downtown for events and the station
- “Relative to demand” and “if need” isn’t enough to encourage people to get out of their cars
- Clarify that the outcomes refer to “Parking for cars” instead of just “parking” – add parking for scooters, bikes, etc.
- Add shared use parking here and in the Design Guidelines as well
- “Continue to implement” should reflect an intentional evaluation, not just taking them at face value
- Mitigate impact to neighborhoods

Housing (DSA)– 3 red, 14 yellow, 8 green, 3 abstentions

- Change first bullet to maximize housing opportunities across all incomes
- Support maximizing density to maximize transportation use
- Think about and define indirect displacement – how do you measure and mitigate this?
- Add “preserve the character of neighborhood housing and surrounding areas”
- Include both existing and future workers
- Percentage of affordable housing should reflect workforce needs based on income levels

- Who should be protected from displacement? Low and very low incomes, or moderate too? Or everyone?
 - Low-income renters are most vulnerable and need the most help.
 - Displacement affects everyone, including cash-poor, house-rich families.
 - [SAAG members were asked to hold up cards if they agree that the focus is lower-income households – 10 green and 5 red]
- Include the word “gentrification” (details and words matter)
- Replace “avoid” displacement – with “no” displacement
- “No displacement” is pretty extreme
- Recognize conflict between contributing funds for affordable housing development/preservation and requiring on-site inclusionary units

Housing (City-wide) – 2 red, 13 yellow, 10 green, 2 abstentions

- Include “city and” regional housing crisis
- Outcomes should directly address the responsibility of Google
- Recognize the citywide impact of this large development on low/very-low income populations specifically
- Add “on publicly-owned land” to the second statement about where to add more affordable housing
- Requiring “no displacement” could conflict with other goals like redevelopment that results in a net increase of high density, affordable housing
- Is “Displacement” tied to a specific geography? City? Transit hubs?

Jobs (DSA) – 7 red, 10 yellow, 4 green, 6 (estimated) abstentions

- Emphasize benefits to local businesses (with big development)
- Add “apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs”
- We shouldn’t mandate wages without analyzing job types. This should be city or region-wide requirement, not put on a single project.
- Remove “long-time” from B
- Add more broad terminology to A, more than living wage
- Add connections between jobs and supporting schools

Jobs (City-wide) – 4 red, 13 yellow, 2 green, 8 (estimated) abstentions

- Every wage should be a living wage
- Add innovation and innovative partnerships
- For C, focus on programs that work (no preference for existing)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following are public comments that were presented at the meeting.

- Google should now start being more involved in the process.
- The housing crisis is having a large impact on schools and immigrant families.
- Housing should be in transit-shed (the City should optimize policies).

- How can we sustain our culture and populations?
- We want Google to help make the roads more pedestrian and bicycle friendly, especially Stockton, Julian, Coleman, The Alameda, and Bird.
- We appreciate what Google is doing and we appreciate the tax revenue.
- Provide more connections to the airport and to SJSU.
- Integrate green roofs and bird-friendly designs.
- Small businesses are declining rapidly.
- Incorporate the community into the ideas.
- Emphasize employment opportunities, centered at Diridon.
- Consider Costa Hawkins and other rental policies.
- Technology and current decisions by the City are encouraging gentrification.
- There is no alternate for the houseless representative on the SAAG.
- The City should have pedestrian/bicycle facility fees.
- Creeks need to be stronger elements in the plans.
- Centering housing at Diridon supports long-range commuters instead of local commuters.

NEXT STEPS AND MEETING SCHEDULE

Lee Wilcox presented upcoming meeting dates, along with information where public comments could be submitted after the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm following this item.