

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Councilmember Campos: And can we have roll call at this point?

>> Ed Shikada: Okay, I'll do it, sure, no problem. Chair Liccardo, not here at this time. Vice-chair Campos, here. Rose Herrera, here.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay, so we're going to go -- review of the work plan. And Ed Shikada, do you want to go over that with us?

>> Ed Shikada: Yes, thank you. Madam vice chair, just like to note that we've got two items that we are recommending for deferral to August, the LED street light master plan and the update on the municipal regional storm water permit implementation.

>> Councilmember Campos: And we need a motion to --

>> Councilmember Herrera: Motion to defer.

>> Councilmember Campos: Second? All those in favor, aye, that passes unanimously. And then we just need a motion for the one item on the consent calendar.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Motion to approve consent.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Second.

>> Councilmember Campos: All those in favor, aye, that passes unanimously. And now we'll go to item D, which is report to committee, and that's a verbal report on energy efficiency and renewable energy activities. You're ready, good.

>> John Stufflebean: John Stufflebean, director of environmental services. We have a three-part report today and we'll make it go pretty quickly for you. Start off with a report on energy efficiency efforts at the -- renewable energy efforts at the libraries. The second part will be a quick report on our waste to energy progress, and the third part, an update on our grants. And so here from libraries Mary Naku and Mary Tucker, the two Marys, and I think Mary Tucker, you are going to do the presentation on the libraries. So we'll just dive right into that.

>> Thank you. And Mary from the library will be available for any questions and her staff, so good afternoon. So some highlights, and we've been working with the library on energy efficiency for their building. So here you see some highlights from the Martin Luther King library, where we've reduced energy -- they have reduced energy consumption by 29% saving about \$310,000 annually as a result of the retrofits and receiving \$387,000 from PG&E as an incentive. So thrilled about that. At the pearl avenue branch library I've personally been out here and it's wonderful to see the solar glass which is quite colorful as you can see right there. And this branch was designed to meet LEED certified standards. And the solar glass is a part of the public art. So we're incorporating that. And it has -- provides enough power to illuminate an LED lamp which states in all of those hieroglyphics, I suppose, we are all one, that is in the entrance area. So the solar glass is in the children's part so it is quite colorful and then the East San José Carnegie branch also designed to meet LEED certified, has a uniquely designed mass cooling system in the basement to allow for cooling in the summer allowing some thermal mass, great creativity at some of the library facilities. As far as solar installations, oh, it's missing! There's no solar slide, maybe. Sorry, but reading from the report, the Alviso library has a three kilowatt system that was installed as a result of the CDBG funding, community development block grant and under consideration are 11 more libraries as part of the overall 50 megawatts of solar goal. And we are getting ready to release an RFP for 20 megawatts on 38 facilities of which 11 of those are libraries. So looking again at libraries and their associated parking lots. So any questions on the library?

>> Councilmember Campos: So are there any questions right now on the library? Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: On the new libraries, are we including those that haven't been built yet to be included in some of the solar projects here?

>> The new ones are not. As of yet. What we have done for the most recent 20 megawatt RFP is to identify those facilities using general funds that have the highest energy bills so that we are able to lower those energy bills and have that opportunity for savings. The new ones are looking at it and seeing to what extent they can use the funding that they have available to incorporate solar.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Yeah, I guess if there's some efficiency that we can build into the design I guess I would want -- I would want to know that going forward.

>> Energy efficiency are built into it. We used savings by design by PG&E.

>> Let me add onto that a little bit, Councilmember Herrera. Mary Naku assistant library director. All the buildings have been and are currently being designed to LEED certified standards, they will be LEED silver, the new ones that open. They are also being built to handle solar, solar capable, should we decide those are possible and we could build it better to be more efficient over time we will do that.

>> Councilmember Herrera: The building will be enabled to accommodate solar?

>> It will be strong enough.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Rather than retrofit it at a later date. Thank you for the report.

>> Councilmember Campos: I'm going to turn it back over to the chair, he has arrived.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: We are asking questions about the library, I don't know if the Vice Mayor had questions around that. Okay, I'm turning it over.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Councilmember Campos, I appreciate the help, and my apologies.

>> John Stufflebean: So that was the first part of the three-part energy report. Shall we go on to the second part?

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, I will keep my mouth shut then.

>> John Stufflebean: Okay, second part of the energy report is on the status report on waste-to-energy projects, and Michelle Young is here from IWM to give us an update on that.

>> All right, thank you. We'll do a quick review of some of the goals and objectives that we're working on in our waste-to-energy strategies which you've seen in both the zero waste strategic plan and more recently in the energy plan. and they're outlined here, including feasibility analysis, partnering with the private sector, and I will highlight a couple of these, such as the commercial solid waste RFP, and the treatment plan master plan, and grant funding. You will also see in your boxes, this week, hopefully by the end of the week, a full informational memo. That as a result of a question that came up in the budget hearings, and so there will be a greater amount of detail in that memo. All right. So one of the key opportunities that we have at this point is in the redesign of the commercial solid waste system, where we are bringing the system into an exclusive franchise and contract for processing. So this creates an opportunity to get one of the largest waste sectors in the city, both for diversion purposes and also conversion to energy. So it created a great opportunity for us to open this up through the public process, and we do have, we made a request for processing options that would provide energy in the RFP for processing technology. On April 16th, we did receive proposals which are closed at this point, so I can't give you any details about how many and who. But we are reviewing conversion technologies within that proposal set. So we're thrilled with the proposals that we've received and those are undergoing both staff and expert consultant technical review at this time. Another one of our integration opportunities is through the waste treatment plant master plan. Because of the resources available including the capacity of the digesters that exist at the plant, land availability which is creating a great interest in the private sector and feedstock such as biosolids for conversion,

we have a great opportunity at the plant to do demonstration, create showcase kinds of projects. So the nine part anaerobic digestion project is continuing through the negotiation process and development of that project on the Nine Par site. We also received a response to the City Manager's RFI for demonstration pilot on fog. The fats, oils and grease. Proposal we received is being evaluated for potential introduction into the fats, oils and grease into the digesters to get added energy from those. So basically again the plant master plan provides us overlapping opportunities which are very valuable for some of the other projects that we're looking at. And a couple of things that we're working on are the demonstration partnership which came out and recently the RFI that was released, the city received over 44 proposals, and four of those were for conversion technologies. So we did an initial feasibility study on those and decided to enter into an agreement with harvest power that's proposing a demonstration scale gasification facility at the plant. This is one of their plants in Germany. You can see the people there barely. It is quite a small demonstration facility, and they are requesting under two acres for a very small-scale facility. This created an excellent overlap for us in grant funding opportunities at the time that we were identifying the RFI proposals the California energy commission released a grant that we were able to respond to in partnership with harvest power. That grant which was submitted in -- on May 20th, is for \$1.9 million, and that would be for feasibility study and a demonstration-scale gasification unit which could be located at the plant. So we are taking advantage of any grant funding opportunities that are available. In January we also submitted an anaerobic digestion infrastructure grant for \$10 million. We were in the top half of the proposers. We did not receive that grant, but we've seen great value in being able to coordinate with the CEC on how we can be more competitive, and the kinds of things that we're looking for. So we were able to actually a much more fine tuned proposal in the second submittal.

>> John Stufflebean: Okay, and then if it please the chair we'll move right into the third part which is more information about grant opportunities.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Unless we have questions on this part? Nope, great.

>> On June 22nd at the city council you will see two memos related to grant agreements with the Department of Energy, one finalizing our Solar America city grant, our market opportunities, and Green Vision showcase, the

second one dealing with the local energy assurance program, which will address energy and emergency issues, so working with our office of emergency services on incorporating energy issues within our emergency planning documents and plans. In August we will be bringing to you the grant agreement with PG&E for the innovation pilot program. That will be -- we'll be able to expand housing rehab and be able to install higher efficiency equipment that the housing department would not have been able to install otherwise, so that cost differential will be able to provide that. And then mini grants for energy education for community groups, nonprofits, neighborhood groups throughout the area on energy education. In August or September we'll be bringing to you retrofit California, this is the statewide program funded by EECBC, energy efficiency and conservation block grant program, a coalition involving Los Angeles county San Diego, Sacramento and ABAG came together for a program and \$30 million is being spent statewide on a variety of different things. This one will be addressing a whole-house neighborhood or whole-neighborhood approach to retrofit, working with our strong neighborhoods initiative and the housing department, and also working with Work2Future on energy business microloans. And then as you heard on RFIs there were 44 proposals, 11 of those related to energy or solar, and we've come down to three possibly moving forward on the solar side. And so we'll be meeting with them next week to explore that and one with our Planning Department and online permitting.

>> John Stufflebean: And that concludes our presentation.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you very much. Very promising projects. Any questions or comments? Councilmember Campos.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you some Councilmember Liccardo. First of all, very intriguing that we're going to start moving into the neighborhoods around solar and what a perfect partnership with strong neighborhood initiative areas, since they're going through a new transformation on how they will be governing themselves in the neighborhoods. This is an opportunity for them to put their efforts towards hopefully talking to neighbors about retrofitting their homes around the solar to save money, as well as save energy. So just a few questions. I know that you mentioned and in the memo it talks about the partners, Los Angeles County, ABAG, San Diego, Sacramento County, and as well as our own County of Santa Clara. Are they partnering with them --

>> County of Santa Clara is not partnering on this.

>> Councilmember Campos: So they haven't decided that --

>> They decided not to participate but tgeb we got in there, the City of San José proper.

>> Councilmember Campos: So at this point it's only the City of San José really representing the northern part of this project.

>> Along with ABAG.

>> Councilmember Campos: With ABAG.

>> Right, and that includes, for ABAG it's San Francisco, Alameda and Sonoma.

>> Councilmember Campos: So we do have some Northern California cities that are part of this.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Campos: So my question to you is, as we have this discussion regarding the California first, and ABAG's role in this, what are we -- are we looking at creating or partnering or is there a discussion about how we will create local standards for contracting? Contractors, excuse me.

>> Thank you for that question. We have been looking at that issue. When we, when the council adopted the resolution to participate in the California first program, and our solar America city grant will allow us to do additional marketing on that California First program. Within that resolution we stated that we would abide to the rules that are established by California first and Sacramento County as their administering agent. And so they

have existing contractor standards to address a lot of those issues. Santa Clara County is considering additional standards right now. Since they have signed onto it also. But California first has determined that any additional standards would have to be approved by them, and if they wanted to go ahead with it, they would have to understand the cost associated with it, and all cities within Santa Clara County would have to give their buy-in approval for it. So the cities could opt out on that, and no moneys from the California state energy program which are going to the county can be used for incorporating and developing and implementing those additional standards. So we have heard about the potential additional standards, the green living, the green wage associated with that. The county would actually their facilities committee is hearing that issue this week and their general counsel provided a report that says we need more study, we need to understand the costs associated with this and to understand the impact on the market. And so they are going to be coming back to that. And then they would have to come to the cities and ask for our participation in that. So it would need some additional analysis on our part to understand the impacts of that, and if, you know --

>> Councilmember Campos: So do you think that you have a mental time line when that process would all happen and information would get back to the council? Because I know we have certain time lines that we're meeting, but you outlined a lot of other things, and they're having meetings, and how does that move with our --

>> I would -- I mean, the other thing that sort of throws a wrench into this is that there's been an injunction against the State of California by the western Riverside council of governments. And so the whole program has stopped. The whole California first program has stopped until the energy commission can address this writ of mandate that has been called down. And so we are now hearing whereas we had thought September, we're now thinking possibly later. But I do know -- so that time line has all been delayed to initiate that. I would think that we could start to look at these things probably over the next three or four months and see what's happening on a county wide basis and see what's going on so --

>> Councilmember Campos: So off the top of your head you mentioned that there are certain standards that they have and that we're looking at other standards or there are other standards that are being looked at. What

are some of the additional standards that would have to go? If you have them that's fine if you don't you can give us an info memo that would need to go through the process to be approved?

>> We have not been able to do that side by side comparison yet, so that is something we could get back to you on.

>> Councilmember Campos: That would be great, if you could get back to us, and I won't ask that it be done before we go on break, so I know that there is time to actually do that. But I think this is an exciting opportunity for the City of San José along with some of the other counties to be at the cutting edge and be at the forefront in retrofitting our neighborhoods.

>> And I apologize, did you ask for that before the break?

>> Councilmember Campos: No, after the break. I was trying to make a funny and it wasn't very funny. [Laughter]

>> I just heard before the break.

>> Councilmember Campos: No, I wouldn't ask you before the break. But thank you for the presentation. Those are all my questions.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I just had one question. The gasification feasibility project that's being conducted I guess with harvest power, is that all waste, food waste, fog?

>> Right, the gasification technology that we're proposing would be using wood waste, which is currently trucked all over the state for co-generation. Most of the woody material that's collected in San José is already incinerated in co-generation facilities depending on the market, it moves as far as Redding. But mostly in the Central Valley. So wood waste and then we'd be testing biosolids so as an integration opportunity for the plant. So

gasification is one of the technologies that they're looking at through the plant master plan as a way to manage biosolids. So that's what we'd be looking at. So it would not be food or municipal solid waste that would be gasified.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great, thanks, Michelle. Thanks for the wonderful presentation. I don't believe we need a motion on that, do we?

>> Nope.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Nope. All right, thank you for all that information. Move on to item D-2, the trail program report, Yves Zsutty is here. Welcome, Yves.

>> Yves Zsutty: Just a moment, please.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: And John Brazil is also with us. Hi John.

>> Hello.

>> Yves Zsutty: Good afternoon, committee members my name is Yves Zsutty with Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services I'm joined by John Brazil of the Department of Transportation. And I manage the trail program for the city. John manages the bike ways program and we coordinate regularly to make sure that the bicycle facilities onstreet and offstreet work well and we're working together on goal 10 of the Green Vision to make sure we get 500 miles of bike facilities by 2022. So our presentation today is to talk to you about that coordination and some highlights of the work we've been doing. And john will start off with the next slide.

>> Thank you, Yves, councilmembers. First, I want to give Yves credit for the vast majority of the presentation. It is primarily trails, and he's done an excellent job on it. I'll just share a little bit of information on the on-street bikeways network as it relates to connecting with the trails. And as you can see from this first slide, and Yves

mentioned, in addition to the Green Vision, city council last November unanimously passed bike plan 2020 which is a ten year vision for building out a completed network of 500 miles of bike ways, would include 100 miles of trails which are offstreet and 400 miles of onstreet bike ways which is what I work on implementing. So the beauty of that, and it's hard to tell from this diagram, is that we are implementing using a strategy that can be analogized to highways where you have a backbone of bike ways that will get you across town just like you have freeways that will get you across town. And that's what this image on the screen highlights. I know it's hard to see the details, but we primarily use the off-street network of bike ways, Yves' trail system, to get people across town. And we are now, as this committee's heard report before, developing some enhanced on-street bike ways to make people feel more comfortable to connect these off-street bike ways. So we're excited about that. And the primary enhanced on street network, as the slide mentions, will provide the east-west connections, including trail-like enhancements. Next slide please. This is an example kind of a simulation of what some of these enhanced on street bike ways might look like. We are right now working with consultants to develop three on street enhanced bike way pilot projects one of which would be a north-south connection on fourth street in the downtown area. This would connect the university with northern part of town and normally, on streets, we follow state standards that say design the facility a certain way and that limits us in some ways because it usually doesn't allow for something that might make bicyclists feel more comfortable. So this is an image an example of what we're going to pursue. A two-way colored, perhaps colored, bike way onstreet that feels more trail like and provides a buffer between the bicyclists and the traffic. We hear this a lot from our constituents that I don't feel comfortable riding a bike on street with cars. And so this is our attempt to address that issue. We're going to be working with federal and state regulators because it is a nonstandard treatment, if we're successful with this on our pilot in San José you could see this in other cities in state and country.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Sorry to interrupt but going back for a moment, that is actually 4th we're looking at, not San Fernando, right?

>> Correct. This is 4th Street looking left. The library's on your left.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, so the San Fernando treatment is contemplated to be different than that; is that right?

>> We haven't finalized design, but likely this North-South 4th Street corridor won't include color. Yet the East West San Fernando would include color, still to be determined.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you.

>> This is another type of enhanced on street bike way that we might implement. Likely in the river oaks corridor, our third enhanced pilot project, this is what we're calling a buffered bike lane, which has in this example from Santa Cruz two features. One is a little mountable curbing separating the bicycles from traffic and also a striped hatched buffered area. We will likely use the mountable curb treatments in our river oaks pilot project. That project will connect Yves' trail networks, two of his primary corridors, the Guadalupe river trail and the Coyote creek trail, but will also link with jobs in the North San José area and transit on First Street with light rail and bus systems. I think this is the last slide for me. And we just wanted to highlight some of the progress we've made to date. We are really accelerating with the limited resources we have, accelerating implementation of bike ways. As you can see Fawn for the on street network last year we completed seven projects, for this year we're looking at completing 15 projects which we're very excited about, a few of which you saw on previous slides. A few indicators of success are bike mode share, the percentage of trips made by bike, has actually tripled in the previous two years. The most recent two years reported, which is -- these are census figures. That's pretty exciting. That brings us from .4% of trips which was pretty low, two years ago, to 1.2% of trips which is more than double the national average. The national average is only .5% of trips. By the way, our bike plan 2020, one of its top 5 goals is to reach 5% of all trips by bike. So you can get a sense of where we are. This current rate of 1.2% in San José is the second highest rate among the largest cities in the U.S. second only to Philadelphia. So while there's room for progress I think we're doing well on the way. So that's all for the on street network. Back to Yves.

>> Yves Zsutty: Thanks John. Wanted to show you what we're doing with the help of the Santa Clara Valley Water District. This slide shows that we've got about 53 miles of trails in the city. We've been able to occupy 38

miles of those trails through collaborative agreements with the Water District and we're developing those projects on 15 miles of land that they own. So that relationship is something we want to continue and encourage. And it's helped us become one of the nation's largest biking and walking trail networks. When we look at what we're doing in San José we're coordinating John and I carefully because we're developing a transportation system here for the bicycle. And this data helps to show that we're different than other places in the country. San Diego is always talked about as this glorious place with wonderful weather. And we have the same thing. But what they have in their situation is bike travel that is much more recreational orientated. You see a peak in the late morning and it drifts off for the rest of the day. When you look at San José we've got a clear morning, midday, and p.m. peak, which is very much like the roadway system. We gather this data every September and we continue to see the trend. We're catching over 50% of the people on trails are commuting to work and if we look at how we're laid out we did an analysis of our existing trail systems, did a bubble around each trail system of three miles. And when we do that we cover 99% of the city with trail access. So if you live in San José, you should be able to find a trail within three miles of your front door already in its current state. So all the work that we're going to do over the next ten or 12 years is to close gaps, add more depth to that trail system so there will be more trails available. It's important to note on this stat that we looked at it because the rails trail conservancy had a mission to get the United States up to 90% -- to get 90% of the cities up to this level of design. So we're already there. And so we're a great example for that organization to look at. We continue to get awards, most recently we got an award for the Albertson walkway at the 25th annual trails and greenways conference, and we show up in national media all the time as one of the fittest healthiest cities because of our bikes and trails facilities. Developing all these projects require that we go after a lot of grant. This table shows you the grant writing that's gone on over the last six years and this current year we've written three times as many grants as we have from the average of past years. We've got \$22 million of grant writing done already this fiscal year, and we've been awarded \$1.3 million, and \$19 million is pending. We haven't heard any declines yet. We're just waiting to hear the status on those grants. I'll run through some projects that are going on. Since last time I was here we completed a short segment about half mile on Penitencia creek trail which clarified a shortcut that was already been used by the neighborhood. We're doing nine miles of planning work along the Coyote Creek Trail which sets us up nicely to design and build that in future years. We're doing that as alongside flood protection with the Water District. We're doing design work on the lower Guadalupe. We're just waiting for our final comments, we can finalize our plans and get construction going

on later on this calendar year for 6.4 miles of paved trail. The image on the lower right is quality of trail entry ways we're going to do all along this alignment, so we take the visual quality of the park and repeat it down to Alviso. You get a sense of the trail as you enter from Alviso. Designing a 500 foot bridge in Alviso. We're doing design work to get closer to Alum Rock park and Penitencia creek. We're designing in South San José in District 9, our only trail project in District 9. We're doing construction projects from Branham to Chenoweth. And working on designs for a massive pedestrian bridge in south San José. That will link Guadalupe creek to Guadalupe river and out to lake Almaden. Working again with the Water District, it may have been about a year ago I know some councilmembers and the Water District board got together to break ground on a flood control project on Lower Silver Creek. We worked really hard with them over this past few months to find a solution to provide better trail access. The master plan we had completed for the trail out here on Lower Silver Creek between Jackson and Capitol Expressway had people walking down in the channel where the vehicle is shown on this image. And that wasn't ideal because that was going to be underwater throughout the year and we couldn't put a hard trail service, it was going to be a gravel service. So we think we've gotten some really good success by coordinating because now we have space to develop a trail up at top of bank borders by existing fences and a flood wall that will be a few feet. People have views of the creek, they would be lie and dry and we would communicate with the council on how to get that part of project built. They're going to leave the dirt path for us there to come back and pave but it's set up well for us to build a trail now. We're about 20% complete on the Lower Silver Creek project out at Silverstone Place. We've done all the grading on the Guadalupe river trail. This picture was a preconstruction meeting. About a month ago all the grading work was done. This is Guadalupe river trail going underneath the interchange at 280. And last time I was out there about two weeks all the base rock was done so we're moving along really quickly. We've complete our guidelines for the milestone marker system, so every quarter of a mile now we're going to have a very simple marker which will give you the distance you've traveled, the trail system you're on, and the 911 center they're going to know the pavement surface, the closest entry and exit to the trail, anything that could prevent a vehicle from getting into the space, and a way for the police to record incidents in the future. So we've addressed the trail system now in a way we've addressed the roadway system. And we also have graphics-based signage so it's more easy and interesting to read and follow hopefully. City of Santa Clara likes our plan so much that they're actually going to start working on deploying milestone markers out on their trails as well. With that John and I would be glad to answer any questions.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Yves and John. Judy.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I think you know my question because I ask it every time. On the project being designed, there was reference to the Guadalupe trail, which is as you say, there's just not much in the trail category in District 9. And I'm always asking about east-west connectivity in District 9. I know you've got some pilot projects on -- through D.O.T. Connecting trails downtown. Just looking for hopefully an answer.

>> Yes, councilmember you might be referring to some of our two bike boulevard pilot projects that we're working on. I'm not sure if I'm remembering the district borders correctly so correct me if I'm wrong. We have two bike boulevards we're developing for implementation in the upcoming fiscal year, one is kind of along Charmarin and Jacob, another is Colero and Palmea. And I'm sorry, I don't remember the district boundaries. Am I way off here?

>> Councilmember Chirco: Not entirely, but I don't know that those achieve the connectivity, maybe like a Branham or a Hillsdale, even Foxworthy. But to get from Guadalupe, if you are in the center of the district, there's no way you can get to the Guadalupe trail or the Los Gatos creek trail safely.

>> That's a great question. And one of these bike boulevard projects, the Charmarin Jacob, will actually get you from south central, kind of Willow Glen area, all the way to Los Gatos creek trail, with the continuous bike way through calmer residential neighborhoods with some on-street enhancements to provide kind of a more comfortable level. Because I agree that part of the challenge for myself and Yves is to make the connection. We have a partially completed network so it's not continuous yet and you're pointing out a perfect example. So moving forward, we're going to be connecting better, and that's one example I can give of which -- I know it's hard to visualize, but I'd be happy to give you a map of the project detail offline.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I would appreciate this. This is a question we've asked for years and I know it is something on the radar but I would be grateful for that. Thank you.

>> Certainly.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Councilmember Campos.

>> Councilmember Campos: So Yves it's been a long journey. I like looking at some of the trails that you commented on so I'm not going to ask a lot of questions but just around the silver stone, when is the time line for that one to be completed?

>> Yves Zsutty: Offhand I can't remember. I'm thinking it was December-January time frame but I'll send your staff an e-mail after this meeting.

>> Councilmember Campos: That would be great, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Rose.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you, Yves and John, for the report. And I had the pleasure of walking with staff out there, and also Councilmember Campos, who's worked very hard over the years that she's been in office, to support the completion of the Silver Creek trail, so I want to commend her publicly for her work. And we had a chance to look at that, and then I walked along Thompson Creek until the staff kind of convinced me to get in a car, because they didn't want to walk the trail anymore. Because I think it's really helpful to -- well, I wanted to walk the whole trail, you know, there's a limit here. I think it's really good to walk along and see what's actually there. It's one thing to see a map. It's another thing to get it on the trail and get the perspective of what it's like to bike or walk along it as a resident. I really appreciate the staff going along with me and taking a look at it. My concern, and I think it's incredible, the plan we have and the work that's been done. Obviously there's connections that aren't there yet, in various districts. In District 8, one area that I'm very concerned about is Thompson creek, the ability to get across there, crossing capitol expressway in a safe manner. I would like to see a bridge, a pedestrian-bike bridge, eventually across capitol expressway. I mentioned that to you guys, and I'm going to

continue to talk about the need for that. And just the whole idea, I think it's kind of going along with what Vice Mayor Chirco was talking about, in terms of some of the connections we make, are it's not safe to go from point A to point B with these wonderful trails. I guess what I would like to see is some planning put into place where we know we don't really have the money to launch these projects now, but we have a vision. We need to put that into a plan for the future. Things like pedestrian bridges, areas where we need to connect. I'm very concerned about it because there's a lot of, when I decided to bike to work, I didn't do it this year, I did it the previous year with Ed Shikada, who was nice enough to join me in that. And there was a lot of points along the way from district 8 that you just don't feel safe. Sort of competing with big trucks along the roadway on Tully, getting across the 101, things like that. So I think we need to look at planning on those and at least get them in some kind of a beginning-stage plan as to how we're going to connect people up, so that they can bike recreationally. And there's a lot of people that want to be able to use bikes to actually get to work, too, as you've pointed out, so I guess --

>> We're there. John and I have looked at that issue and John's bike master plan talks about the cross-town connectors and so one of our coordination efforts is to look at those in some detail and figure out what it is to get those projects done and how do we add linkages to and from the trails, people recognize that's where they should need to leave the trail to go across town. That would be the plan some getting the bike numbering system employed. The big plan is out there, we just need to do the legs work now.

>> Councilmember Herrera: How do you contemplate people crossing major expressways? It's great you're doing this crossing down in the southern area, to facility Almaden. What are you guys doing about capitol expressway?

>> I think one of the solutions to that is identified in bike plan 2020, which calls for seeking funding and planning for more bike/pedestrian overcrossings of major freeways or expressways, or Capitol Expressway as an example of a major roadway. Because as you know many people simply don't feel comfortable crossing a major roadway like that, and that's one of the most challenging places to ride a bike, is if you're confident enough to even be on a major arterial, then you get to a freeway interchange, and you want to pull your hair out. So bike plan 2020 identifies a long term goal of bike-ped bridges over freeways spacing every two miles. Now, that's not funded,

that's very aggressive, and to be honest quite costly, but we are working with VTA and MTC to identify funding to address those needs. And VTP 2045, or maybe it's called VTP 2040 now, I don't remember, actually has a few projects identified for regional funding in the future for just these types of bridges.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Great, well, I haven't seen the one specifically that addresses the Thompson Creek crossing that I'm concerned about. But the planning is great. Obviously we don't have all the funding now but if we have the plan in place at least we know what's working towards. And communities feel they are being taken into account as we move forward to get funding to complete these things. The last thing I wanted to ask you about --

>> Councilmember, if I could mention about that Thompson creek project.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Sure.

>> We wanted to look at a grant to pursue development of the Thompson Creek trail out there. And in talking with VTA staff, the concern is density in the neighborhood. So it's -- you know with San José is a built place so maybe it's an issue too where we can use some champions with the VTA to say ideally it would have been better to be high density. But it is what it is so help us get people to those facilities. So we get push back from the densities out in that area.

>> Councilmember Herrera: And we can take it offline to talk about it, but you have two VTA board members sitting here so maybe we can talk to VTA about it. Because I think it's essential when you have capitol expressway is virtually a freeway. You've got neighborhoods bisected by these freeways and unable to move freely across them to be able to take advantage of amenities like Thompson creek and other kinds of things that are happening on the West Side of the Capitol Expressway, like Eastridge. It also helps connect people with economic opportunity and with shopping opportunities, transit opportunities because you have the large Eastridge station that's going to be developed shortly, and you've got this big expressway blocking people from getting there. So -- and it's not just that people are frustrated. People are killed on capitol expressway trying to cross

it! So it's something we really need to look at, and I'd be happy to work with you guys on it. I had one last comment. I love the idea of the signage and the directional signage that you're putting on the bike trails and the trail system. I think it would be great, too, and I know you guys talked about wayfinding signage and also historical signage, so that I think councilmember -- if I'm not mistaken you were also working on that in historical aspects of these trails, because I think then that adds to the recreational opportunities for everyone to be able to recognize where there's interesting historical spots along the way of those trails. So and maybe there's opportunities then to seek funding from the local communities to help do that. Because I think people want to remember, they want to recall you know where this particular historical thing took place and be able to share that with people who come new to the community to talk about the heritage and the history of those locations. And there's a very rich heritage along these trails too.

>> Every master plan we do looks at the history of the area, and we look for opportunities to deploy interpretive signs. On the trail website you'll find about 35 interpretive already deployed that tell the city's history, and then the new signage that we'll install has a destination sign that we can use to point people to museums or historical landmarks from the trail.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great, Yves and John thank you. And congratulations on all your great success. I just had a couple of questions. On the signage and milestone markers Councilmember Herrera alluded to I think there's certainly opportunities out there certainly for companies if they're interested in getting their branding out and you know every time you go to a bike event it looks like an SVLG convention. I wonder, have we approached local companies to see if they're interested at all in -- I don't know if we're able to legally -- to be able to get some sponsorship for signage, and marketing and so forth, some of those things that it's a little harder to get the grant money for.

>> Yves Zsutty: Department works to create the San José parks foundation, so that helps address issues with private money coming through the city. So you know, that organization is looking for projects and with the amount of money they have coming in signage may be a much better project than paving a mile of trail. So I'll float that idea to people who would be able to talk to --

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I would be happy to help any way I can.

>> For the on-street network, it's definitely a concept worth pursuing. To be honest, councilmember, I'm not informed enough to know whether the constraints of an onstreet signage system allows for that type of sponsorship, but it's definitely something that I'll definitely look into and get back to your office.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: The City Attorney's office may have something to say about it, but -- thank you very much, Mollie. Last week, Rose and I were in a VTA meeting where we approved the TDA count -- grants that were given, and within the TDA as you know there's a BEP funding which is not a lot of money. And so I acknowledge, this isn't really a fair question, because you guys are chasing a lot of grant money right now, and I know that you're succeeding in many ways. But San José didn't have a project submitted in this round. Only three cities did, and I think Morgan Hill got the money. I was just wondering, is there a reason why we're not chasing that pot of money?

>> Yves Zsutty: You mean the TDA or the BEP?

>> Councilmember Liccardo: The BEP.

>> Yves Zsutty: The BEP is a federal source of funds. It's got a number of funds, but the federal was the money coming through. We are going to pursue BEP funds for Los Gatos creek trail. So we'll be doing it in a subsequent round. But part of the challenge is to have projects that are ready to go that can take federal money, so that means we've had to go through the federal environmental process.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Oh, so you need a full EIR to get it?

>> Yves Zsutty: Yeah, so we've got projects that we're getting shelf-ready, but the timing wasn't quite right.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: So we don't have an EIS that clears all of our trails system citywide, like we do with the General Plan?

>> Yves Zsuttu: No.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Is that something we can do through the General Plan process now, since that's in the oven?

>> Yves Zsuttu: We can look into it, but what I understand of it is, when we do an environmental report for a project --

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Ben's saying no. Okay, bad idea, Sam.

>> Yves Zsuttu: -- we look at all the critters that are under every bridge.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I see.

>> Yves Zsuttu: I mean, we could do an environmental report, but it would be a huge investment, and it can go out of date.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I understand, right.

>> Yves Zsuttu: Once an environmental document is done, we want to get it out two or three years later, or we're in trouble.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, so as critters move, you need new space.

>> Yves Zsuttu: They migrate.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I understand the challenges there. John, did you want to jump in?

>> Yeah, I think from a DOT perspective, focusing on the onstreet networks, generally our projects are not quite as expensive as the offstreet, and that's a blessing in some ways, a challenge in others. So the second point is that the VTA, BPA funds vary every year and because San José's trail projects are understandably a little bit more expensive, sometimes they're too expensive to make that smaller pot of money valuable. Other years they are small enough or large enough. And as Yves pointed out with the federal environmental, the timing is always a challenge. With that in mind, with the onstreet network, we're aggressively pursuing some more creative funding solutions and some new funding opportunities presented by MTC such as their climate initiative funding source, we've submitted an application through that program.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great.

>> Some other outstanding programs like TLC we've recently submitted. So we have a number of applications out there we're excited about we hope to hear back from soon.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: That's great, great to hear. Then my final question is I guess, somewhat in context of Judy's question about Camden and Hillsdale, some of those very wide roads that you have, further South, as you know I'm a great fan of enhancements on street. When we were looking at this a couple of years ago about how we could get some more enhancements on street to make cyclists feel safer one fairly low cost opportunity seemed to be simply using paint to push parked cars away from the curb and create space there between parked cars and a curb. And I'm wondering, is that something we've -- I know we're looking at various treatments right now but most of them tend to be a built more expensive. Have we looked at that particular option as an opportunity particularly on some of these really wide streets on Camden and Hillsdale?

>> Yes, we have. I'll provide a brief answer, and then I don't know if Manuel or anybody wants to add, they have more knowledge and expertise than I do. But as part of the bike plan 2020 development and the community

outreach and the staff analysis, we looked at major arterials and collectors and looked at where existing and future forecasted motor vehicle volumes might warrant a lane reduction to make space for adding a bike lane. And we did identify some corridors where that is a possibility and feasible so they are actually in the master plan saying even though right now we can't fit a bike lane here, we have done the forecasting and identified that we can remove the lanes in the future. That will require CEQA and analysis and funding, so it's not simple. But we have done that kind of planning for the future, and beyond that I'd probably be talking out of my league. So if you have any more detailed questions I'd probably --

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I appreciate the adding of the bike lanes part. I mean, we can talk about this offline if it gets too detailed. I guess I'm really focused more on more than just building in bike lanes, but actually separating the bike lanes from the traffic on the other side of the parked cars. But Manuel, I know, probably has a good answer, so why not.

>> Manuel Pineda from the Department of Transportation. We are looking at different alternatives as it relates to separating the vehicles from the bicyclists. Right now the two current projects that we have are the one that John mentioned, the river oaks one, as well as we are looking at the fourth street where we actually have a curb between them. So relates to the other elements from the general plan and where we're modifying streets, I think we haven't gotten to the level of detail as to what makes sense and what the right approach would be. I think the idea of putting parking between the bicyclists and the travel lanes is still an idea that's out there. You got to find the right corridor where that works, you got to look at driveways and connections and where it makes sense, but it's definitely one of the options that we're going to be exploring as we start developing after the general plan goes through and we have the opportunity to downsize some of those streets, what the right options are. That's still in the mix. It's not in our current batch of projects that are moving forward but it is not something that we have dropped.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks Manuel, I appreciate it. I just wanted to point out, if anybody says that San José is not a bikable city, Bill Ekern and I came from the same place, civic auditorium. I know I was late, but I still got here ten minutes before Bill. I took my bike, and Bill took his car. Oh, you walked. Oh, you ruined it for me,

Bill, you ruined it! Oh well, thanks Yves, thanks John. Darn, I was hoping -- we'll move on then to item D-3, the regional transportation activities report. Hello, gentlemen. Would have given you a ride on my handlebars.

>> I was going to ask.

>> Hans Larsen: Mr. Chair, members of the committee, we have our quarterly regional transportation activities report. The purpose of this is to keep the committee apprised of various activities that are going on in the world of regional transportation. We have a hard copy of the presentation that is coming around. And just note that we have a separate report on the California high speed rail project, so we're not including it under the umbrella of the regional transportation activities report for this month. In terms of transit projects, the three that we wanted to highlight, first is our automated transit network project that is intended to connect the airport with the regional transit system, CalTrain BART and light rail. I got word this weekend the New York times carried a little article about San José's leadership in developing this new form of technology. So it's nice to get national recognition for what we're doing. Another significant thing that happened two weeks ago is that Mayor Reed and Carl Guardino from the Silicon Valley leadership group hosting a briefing on the pod car system. And one of the goals that we have is to try to create for San José and Silicon Valley, the center of a new emerging industry around developing the pod car technology. So this was an opportunity to brief industry representatives in terms of the potential job opportunities from this area. We have coming to the city council on June 22nd authorization for the City Manager to execute three agreements. They're close but not quite there. So we hope to wrap them up in July. First is an agreement with the VTA for funding from them of \$4 million to support our continued development work. And then we've selected two consultants that will help us with the further planning on this. And just in terms of the context, what we're looking at is, while we're excited about the potential of this, as we move forward we want to be assured from both a technical perspective and also from a business perspective that building a project around the airport makes sense at this time. And so we're really doing a very thorough analysis in terms of the business case for moving forward. The other thing that we're working on is, as the committee's aware, we've been selected to host the fourth of international pod car conference. It will be here in San José in October of this year. And we've actually had some of the representatives from Sweden and New York that are actually working on the planning of this, were here as part of the industry briefing that we had a couple of weeks ago. On the topic of the bus rapid

transit projects, we're continuing to work on the development of the Santa Clara Alum Rock project and one thing that sort of a key achievement is relationship and agreement with the VTA whereby the VTA will actually be hiring the City of San José to do some of the design work for this project. Particularly for facilities that the city ultimately will own and operate. And for Alum Rock that will include traffic signals for the portion of the project that goes into capitol expressway we'll be doing lighting and landscaping planning and design work. And then there's also conceptual design work that is moving forward on other BRT projects moving into the San Carlos Stevens Creek corridor as well as the Alameda and El Camino corridors. Those are in the conceptual planning phase. With regards to the BART project the key activities are, we have completed negotiations of a master agreement between San José and VTA for completion of the Berryessa extension of BART. This master agreement will address issues on plan reviews, design standards, how city facilities will be inspected, how we manage construction impact management, aesthetic design. As the committee is aware, the VTA is going to be developing this as a design-build project. So kind of the relationship between the city and the VTA will be different than sort of the normal design-bid build process. So this master agreement makes clear in terms of the roles and responsibilities as we move forward with this. And just like the BRT project, we have our -- are getting funding from the VTA for our support services on the BART project for a detailed plan review and inspection work. So we're pleased with that. One thing I wanted to highlight with regards to BART, and I don't know if folks remember this, so many years ago, we were moving very quickly on working to deliver the entire BART project at one time, and moving into 65% design. Unfortunately the current economic conditions have put a little bit of brake on developing the project. But one of the key planning concepts that we had and that council had approved at a council study session on BART several years ago was that we wanted to theme each of the BART stations in San José with a concept that supported parts of the sort of the character of San José and really reinforce the City's economic development strategy. And so there were three themes that were identified. And for the Berryessa station we wanted to highlight visually with public art and design the environmental qualities of San José, and so this is an elevated station where you've got views of the hills and urban forest and near creeks. And so we wanted to highlights environmental qualities and strengths and San José's leadership in that area. For Alum Rock it was selected that we would celebrate San José's diversity and the people from many cultures. And for the downtown stations we wanted the look around the feel of the stations to really certifies downtown as the creative and cultural center of Silicon Valley. So those continue to be the theme areas that we have. At this point we're only moving

forward on the Berryessa design in the final design. But when we had initially done this work, we had identified a design review committee. Folks that are involved with public art and architecture to help guide the aesthetic design of these stations. And you can see the list of the representatives there that were part of this effort several years ago. They have all agreed to come back and take a look at the more detailed design work that we're moving into on the Berryessa station. And so over the next three months we're going to be working through a process with the design review committee on initial architectural concepts for Berryessa. As you may know, VTA has changed a little bit the location and the layout of the Berryessa station. To meet kind of current needs and to actually address some cost efficiency. And so we're looking at an updated design to the station. And so there will be a process of initial presentation, review and critique from our committee. VTA will take that back and refine it and then they'll do another review. This will help set the stage for what will be a design build development of the station. This is an important opportunity to kind of weigh in on the aesthetic quality and the theming of the Berryessa station. The last area we wanted to highlight were highway projects. And there's quite a bit of activity going on there. We have the 101-Tully project which we expect to start construction this year. CalTrans was originally expected to open bids June 9th for this. They have gotten a request from some of the proposed contractors to extend the bid opening, which is now scheduled for July 21st. So that's about a six-week delay to the bid opening and start of that one. VTA is moving forward on design work for the second phase of work in the east San José Evergreen area, and that's the 101 capitol Yerba Buena project. We have money from the prop 1B CMIA program to move forward with the first phase of the 280-880 Stevens Creek project. And we hope to have that ready for construction in 2012. There is work in final design on the 880 HOV project, and I apologize, some of the red highlighting isn't showing up real clearly here. But that's a project from 101 up to 880. And then CalTrans is doing a ramp metering improvement on the route 280 corridor in the downtown area. Some good news in terms of pavement maintenance on our freeways. CalTrans has awarded a contract to resurface 101 from 87 to Coyote creek. That's in the Edenvale-Evergreen area. So it's a long section of freeway, \$25 million project. And then also, we have a project to repave 880 to 280 to 101. So we're very pleased to see those CalTrans investments. Just in closing, just one last comment, sort of on the topic of managing expectations and one of the realities that we are facing in this budget environment. Our regional transportation program is being affected by the proposed city budget. We have primarily supported this program and the staffing that supports these programs through development fees that come in, our traffic capital program. Our fee revenues are down 50% and we've had to

propose reductions in staffing, really, across the board in our capital programs including regional transportation support. So what our response has been that we've been very active in pursuing funding support from regional agencies, and you heard me mention that both VTA for BRT projects, for the BART projects that have responded favorably, they recognize they need the City's support to move these things forward. We are in similar discussions with high speed rail on that project. But we are going to have to rethink and reset in terms of where we focus on activities, on those parts of the program that leverage the most benefit for the city and in some areas we're just not going to be able to provide kinds of services we've had in the past. And so I think probably one of the areas that councilmembers might see is, we have been very active in trying to make regional projects work in San José in a smooth way, working with the community, and pro actively dealing with complaints. And that's probably an area where may have some challenges in being able to support them. If CalTrans has a freeway paving project or ramp metering, not a whole lot of direct city interface. In the past we've been able to take those complaints and work them through and I think the reality is, that we're not going to be able to provide that level of hand-holding service in the future. So we'll see how it goes but I just wanted to give you a heads-up in terms of the realities of where we're at and we're having to make some cutbacks in this area. With that, that concludes our overview presentation. Manuel Pineda and I are here to answer any questions you might have.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks, Hans. Did you want to launch into high speed rail and then come back to questions?

>> Hans Larsen: We can take them separately or we can start high-speed rail and take them together, whatever is your pleasure --

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Why don't we do that.

>> Hans Larsen: Okay. There we go. Okay. So we have a brief presentation on high speed rail. We've touched on this at reason meetings. Let's go ahead and go to the first slide. So this is Wass defined as the starter system for high speed rail, developing initial connection from San Francisco through San José into the Central Valley to L.A. and Anaheim. This is a \$43 billion project and funds have been identified through state bond measure or

through ARRA funds to cover about 25% of the project cost. So we have \$11 billion available. And this is active in terms of development of getting full project-level environmental clearance. For this as well as the Sacramento and San Diego extensions, and the goal is to have this segment complete by 2020. It is a very assertive goal and will depend on bringing in more funding from federal, private and other sources. We are, as I mentioned, actively working on the environmental clearance, and preliminary design. That's taking the design up to a 15% level, as indicated in our written staff report some of the key issue areas are north of Diridon, which is Diridon to San Francisco piece. There are alignment options that are looking at a range from aerial to trench and tunnel. One of the big challenges for that piece is how to get over, under, around, through the CalTrain maintenance facility. So that is being looked at closely. In the southern part of San José we have the Monterey highway corridor. One of the key issues there is fitting high speed rail in that area. Initially, there was a consideration of tightening the UP corridor. They've come out very strong indicating that they aren't supportive of giving up any of their right-of-way and so we've been working with high speed rail on making parts of Monterey highway available for a cost efficient bullet train corridor. That would involve narrowing Monterey highway from six lanes to four lanes, which we believe is workable and something we've raised as part of the San José general plan update. We have several streets that cross the existing rail corridor that would need to be grade separated. Those are at Skyway, Branham and Chenoweth. We are working with high speed rail on specifics of the design and there's been meetings with the community to keep them apprised of the progress in these areas. The area that's generated the greatest amount of attention is how high speed rail comes into the downtown area, particularly in the downtown core and the neighborhood south of downtown, the greater Gardner area. And the key things that have been focused on are aerial and tunnel options. This next slide illustrates what generally is viewed as sort of the three leading options. There's been eight or nine different options proposed, but the ones that are having the most attention are defined as these three. And so there's a base plan which is the red line on here and this is the one that's been considered historically. It follows the CalTrain corridor, it goes through the Gardner neighborhood and comes into the Diridon station on an elevated configuration. This alignment has generated a lot of concern from the neighborhood because the neighborhood impacts associated with the land uses around there. What is generally viewed as the kind of the best elevated option is an alternative that would have high speed rail follow the yellow line which would contain it within the 87 corridor and then into 280 and then swing up to the Diridon station. A key benefit of this is that it avoid the neighborhood impacts. With any of the elevated options there is concern about

the noise, the visual and blockage of view corridors that are there today now that would be impacted by the evaluated line. The other option that's been looked at is a tunnel option which is shown in the brown, option number 3. And there, kind of the issues that have been raised with that, primarily relate to a very high cost. It's about five times more expensive than the elevated options. In the downtown core area in front of Diridon it would introduce some limits on what kind of development could occur there. The construction impacts, there's some issues on how it relates with BART and impacts with foundations for 280. Very recent news on this. High speed rail issued their preliminary alternatives analysis report just last Thursday. And they have recommended that they proceed with just one option, and this is option 2, in yellow, the 87-280 elevated version. And so as -- let's see, I've got one more slide, let me show -- this indicates sort of the downtown core area with the elevated -- I think there's -- so this is the elevated option, so it would be on top of the existing CalTrain corridor with a station at Diridon, and then the underground option would cut through at a diagonal and have the major station located between the arena and the planned location of the ballpark which is on the lower right. And so next slide indicates sort of the process that we're going through. There have been community meetings in the downtown area. There's been two sets of meetings addressing the elevated and underground options that occurred between actually January, February and May. As I mentioned, the high speed rail released their preliminary alternatives analysis report just last week, with a recommendation to focus on a single option. What's happening next is that high speed rail will come out to the community. They're going to meet further with us as we work to analyze their report and their findings and recommendations over the next weeks and months. Since we prepared this slide we've actually got an announcement that the community meeting in San José for the downtown area will be July 7th at the Gardner community center. That will address the Diridon South area. They've also scheduled a meeting on June 21st which will cover the Diridon North area, and that will be at San José unified's offices on Lenzen Avenue. So those are coming up very soon. And what we're kind of ultimately looking towards is a release of the draft environmental impact report that covers the Diridon station area and that's actually contained in the Diridon to San Francisco piece. And that environmental report is scheduled to come out in December with public hearings scheduled after that. And so that's our quick update on high speed rail. And take it back to any questions or comments.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Hans, thank you for that presentation. I know one of our members of the public has to leave at 3:00 was hoping to ask for the committee's indulgence to ask that community member to come forward and speak now. Scott Knies.

>> Good afternoon, chairman Liccardo and members of the committee, Scott Knies, executive director of the San José downtown association. On Thursday, California high speed rail board recommended that there's no tunnel in San José. And the downtown association is here to talk to the committee about, in the milestones that were just shown to you, you have an opportunity, as the policy makers, to take a look at that. In the report that came out from Thursday's meeting, by the way they released the report Thursday morning, and then had their meeting, California high speed rail board had their meeting on Thursday, so none of us, there wasn't like there was any public review prior to their recommendation that came out Thursday, as you heard there's going to be some community meetings about what they've put forward, which is no tunnel for San José. We're not surprised with that recommendation. High speed rail came out in December, and it was pretty much a rubber stamp back then also, by the staff, no tunnel option for San José. The council, thanks to the mayor and Councilmember Liccardo, asked high speed rail to take a look at the tunnel option in this preliminary alternatives analysis, and they've done so and their conclusion is let's jet son it at this state. It was obviously very premature back in December. It's still premature now. In the little paragraph kind of kiss-off to San José, saying why we're not going to do a tunnel, there were a number of reasons, some of them which were -- which were mentioned very cursory, you know, the BART connection, some of us have thought there might be a real possibility for BART, you know, we're stopping BART at Berryessa but when it ultimately comes into downtown we might be able to share some of the infrastructure there. Cut and cover for BART that was the nicest thing since sliced bread but not for high speed rail. I don't want to debate here today but what we are asking is for you to reserve did option for San José to consider a tunnel. An aerial option coming through what you saw with the wires at Diridon is almost 90 feet high. And it starts to elevate at West Virginia street and still has to go over the Hedding street bridge. This thing is way up in the air. What we've seen in cities like Portland that their tearing down of their freeways and barriers is one of the things credited for the turn around of the city. What we've seen in San Francisco recently with the removal of the Embarcadero freeway, cities are not building barriers anymore, especially in their high density

downtown areas. We're not making a decision on whether it's a tunnel or an elevated option. We're just asking to study it through the environmental impact report.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Scott.

>> And later on there may be a political decision that it's too expensive but don't give up your cards and your place holder for that too early. Just because it's best for high speed rail doesn't mean that it's going to be best for San José.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Scott. Okay, let's return to the committee now for discussion. Either on the high speed rail or on any of the regional transportation projects that were mentioned. Vice Mayor.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I just have a question, as far as the underground versus the above ground. One of my concerns is that San José be treated equally with other cities up the peninsula. And I just remember when 85 went through other cities didn't want full interchanges so you'd have a half of an exchange which pushes the traffic down. So whether it's above ground or below ground, when it gets further down the peninsula what does the conversation look like when they go into equally built-out areas, do they put it above ground in Palo Alto or do they do a cut and cover? I just want the conversation to be the same.

>> Hans Larsen: Yes, we would agree. The issue of equity, you know, across the state or across the Bay Area, is an important consideration. I think in terms of -- there's a range of options that are being looked at. As part of all the environmental studies that are going on with high speed rail, we're at a point in the project where high speed rail is trying to then whittle down to options that are at the most feasible. And so we're starting to see with the report that they released last week, for the San José to Merced piece, our understanding for the -- you spoke to the peninsula area, Palo Alto, Menlo Park, they will be coming back to the High Speed Rail Authority Board I believe in September with the look at the Diridon to San Francisco piece and then also narrowing down the options in that area. So I think you know the time between sort of now and early fall, will be revealing in terms of how this is shaping up and being able to kind of assess the issues of equity that you mentioned.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I think it's significant that they not be taken off the table until the conversation is finalized for the area, all the way up to San Francisco. It's just happened before. And I'd like to think it wouldn't happen again. But I'm not that optimistic. Thank you.

>> Hans Larsen: Uh-huh.

>> Mayor Reed: Rose.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Yeah, as long as we're on the subject of high speed rail, I appreciate Scott Knies's input and I just recollect going on a trip with the chamber to Boston, and the enormous struggle they had with trying to remove an overhead highway that obstructed block neighborhoods, and was really an impediment to developing Boston. Of course everyone that's been here for any amount of time remembers the Embarcadero in San Francisco. I'm -- I'm for keeping options open to look at this. If money were no object, I would say underground, absolutely. So, you know, we may not be able to do the underground option but I certainly think that we should keep it on the table and look at it. Because if we didn't have -- if money wasn't a problem I think a lot of folks would agree that's a better option. And if you look at San Francisco and their infrastructure with their underground subways and how they run underneath Embarcadero and how much they're utilized, I think one of the issues with even being able to utilize transit in San José, is a lot of things should have been undergrounded in the beginning so that we could achieve higher speeds and really make the transit more usable. So one thing I think about in terms of cost is, if we spend the money doing it above ground and then later we have to tear it down, that adds a lot of cost to this project, too. We ought to make sure we are doing it right the first time rather than live to regret it and have to tear it down later so I would like to keep it on the table. I don't know if I could come back and make a motion on that when we are ready.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I would like to second that, but I also remember the '89 Loma Prieta earthquake, and the cypress, and how removal of that very high structure changed the whole context of that community. I would second Rose's motion.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Councilmember Campos, no.

>> Hans Larsen: I would add a comment, there is definitely a cost component towards putting it underground. I think a lot of folks sort of compare it to, well, we can put BART underground. Why can't we do high speed rail? One of the considerations is that the high speed rail infrastructure is just much more massive, that you have tunnels that are two to three times bigger than what a BART tunnel would be, stations that are longer. The station here is, it's a four-track station as opposed to the BART station. So there are some very big cost components. I think one of the pieces of analysis high speed rail did for the San José Diridon to San Francisco piece is they have a budget of \$5 billion for that segment. That every community who is interested in undergrounding the project cost would balloon to \$20 billion just to build the Bay Area piece. So there's some very big numbers associated between the two. The issue of aesthetics has come up a lot and I don't think anybody wants to build another Embarcadero freeway or cypress structure. And one of the things high speed rail has done, to respond to our concerns about it, is if you've seen some of the videos that we've had, I think we showed it at a previous meeting, is that they are responding to and understand being that if they build it underground, whether it's in San José or anywhere else in the state, there needs to be kind of a -- it is not the way you built things in the '50s where things are torn down but I think there's a sensibility of having to build it in a way that fits well with the community and can be attractive and elevated. So those are obviously the debates that are going on. I think we're still kind of analyzing our options and expect to work with our policy makers as we kind of figure out sort of the best way to go forward for San José over the next couple of months.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks Hans. Councilmember Campos.

>> Councilmember Campos: The slide that you have that shows the three options and I'm looking at option 2 which was the yellow line, is it possible to get that aerial picture a little more refined so that I can see exactly the streets that it goes through? I mean, I kind of know the area but it would be helpful to understand exactly the neighborhoods that it would be going through.

>> Hans Larsen: Yeah, one of the I think the big advantages of the yellow alignment, option 2, is that it's largely contained within existing transportation corridors. So rather than cutting through the neighborhood, which is the CalTrain corridor which would need to be widened for high speed rail, is that it is actually staying within the right-of-way of the 87 freeway and the 280 freeway and then it cuts the corner getting back into the CalTrain right-of-way. And so that corner piece is around bird avenue and if you're familiar with the orchard supply hardware?

>> Councilmember Campos: Yes.

>> Hans Larsen: It's essentially coming across that parking lot to come into the Diridon station. It would have I would say a very limited impact to neighborhoods and neighborhood streets and kind of fits into the environment of the existing freeway. That's not to say that the aesthetics of that are any less important in that location. It would have some visibility and high speed rail has shown some I think some striking visual images on how that can be done in a quality way.

>> Councilmember Campos: But it may go to what you were talking about cost but yet not impacting neighborhoods from a visual standpoint?

>> Hans Larsen: The -- I think the cost of the enhanced aesthetics or is that what you're referring to?

>> Councilmember Campos: The fact that we would most likely not have to go with option of a tunnel, if we did two.

>> Hans Larsen: Yes. Option 2 is what high speed rail is recommending now.

>> Councilmember Campos: I would like to be able to visually see that, see that from here, if you could get that, that would be helpful to just send it to us if you can do that.

>> Hans Larsen: I 30 we is send you -- there is actually a video simulation of that alignment I can shoot you a link to.

>> Councilmember Campos: That would be great.

>> Hans Larsen: Uh-huh.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I don't know if I should make a separate motion on high speed rail and do the rest of the motion separately or --

>> I had a question for the motion, this is agendized for acceptance of a progress report. So if you are going to make a motion, I mean my question is is that to refer the report to the full council? Because it's not really on for action by the committee. I'm not sure what action --

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Allow me to make a suggestion. I expect we are going to be seeing something come to council in August, is that fair Hans?

>> Hans Larsen: I would say just kind of the current thinking that we have, is that you know, given the news from high speed rail, in terms -- and our position as a city has been that we would like to have high speed rail develop for us the best elevated option, the best underground option. And so they've done work towards that. And so I think at this point, so they're -- as Scott Knies has indicated, they've narrowed it down to a single option, excluded the tunnel. As we kind of look through the report and I hear further from them in terms of their anything and rationale they present this to the community and we get a sense of how the community is responding to this, our sense is we would want to take something forward to council and weigh informally, in terms of the City's perspective before high speed rail goes too much further so I think probably the August time frame sort of feels about right.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: And the authority has a formal meeting in September as I understand it.

>> Hans Larsen: Yeah, I think probably the most timely opportunity to provide input is in advance of their September board meeting.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Yeah, I hear that, but I'm a little bit concerned that they've already taken action to delete the underground as an option.

>> Hans Larsen: So let me -- the report doesn't --

>> Councilmember Herrera: The report doesn't include one single solution. I'm just a little bit concerned that if we don't say anything, we're sort of accepting that as -- we're accepting the one-option.

>> Hans Larsen: Here's the way to characterize the report. I think for those of us in San José that are used to open government and getting reports out well in advance of meetings, having high speed rail release the report and take action on the same day is a little unusual from how we do business. But the way they look at it is this is a staff report that they want the board to bless first before they release it to the public. So that was the action that they took, is the board didn't act and say hey, this is what we're going to do but they basically accepted staff's recommendation to then begin a conversation with stakeholders like City of San José. Other interested groups, the community, to then begin a formal public review of this proposal. And so they will be seek input June, July, August on this proposal, and then come back to their board in September with a response to the feedback they got and whether they maintain their recommendation or they make changes to it. So opportunity for us to weigh in and comment will be in this sort of period before September.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I still think it is coming before this committee, staff has made a recommendation to have a single option to be considered. I would still like the ability for this committee to direct our staff to question that or somehow get it on the record that we are concerned that staff is making that recommendation. Other than just throwing out so that the community has to defend themselves. I think we're policy makers, we're hearing something that I'm concerned about. It is not that I think we are going to do the underground, we may not be able to, but we shouldn't take it off the table this early in the game.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Mollie, do you want to give us some comment about our scope?

>> Yeah. The only direct would be, that if the committee wants some direction to be provided to staff, the proper thing would be to refer it to council for a full presentation on this, because council would need to give that as a full council to give that direction. You can cross-reference this progress report on to a council agenda if you want to do that.

>> Councilmember Herrera: My motion is to cross-reference it to the full council.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Is that a second?

>> Councilmember Chirco: I accept that motion but I also want to speak to it, too. Because this reminds me of a piece of legislation that says you either have to opt in or opt out, and so they are bringing forward one solution for public hearing. And maybe you'll hear from 200 people that don't want -- they want to look at other options but that's 200 out of a million population. I mean, I'm troubled when they bring forward one solution for community input. I have to agree with Councilmember Herrera, I would second the motion to cross-reference it to the council.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay. That is the motion. And before we take a vote on the motion, were there any other cards from the public, any members of the public to speak? No, okay. All in favor? Any opposed, that passes unanimously, thank you very much. Hi John, I'm sorry, I'm supposed to announce that we're now on to

item number 5, the environmental innovation center development updates and proposed tenants and business operational plans.

>> John Stuffelbean: Thank you very much. I'm going to turn it over to Jo Zientek, deputy director of integrated waste management, who will make the presentation.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Welcome, Jo.

>> Jo Zientek: Thank you for the opportunity to provide an update on all the activities and initiatives that have been underway to help develop the proposed environmental innovation center. Basically what's been going on to date is we've been working on phase 1 of the project. And just to remind you where this site is, it's between, and there is a map up there that you probably cannot read. King Road and McKee road intersection. It's adjacent to fire station number 34. It is not that far from the proposed Berryessa BART station that we were just talking about. Phase 1 will be completed this month. It includes a temporary household hazardous waste dropoff facility, resurfacing and landscaping the area around the facility and we're shooting to begin our first temporary household hazardous waste dropoff events at the end of July. That picture is not the way it looks like today but prior to our making our renovations. Here is what is going on at the site now. And these pictures were taken at the end of May. The site looks much better, it's more secure and we'll be opening the exterior portion of this facility to the public in July. Phase 2, we spent the greater part of this year planning for phase 2 of the environmental innovation center. The proposed programming would be the clean tech development center and you can see that up on the schematic of the site, CTDC. The blue area next to the CTDC is the training, job training center that we're proposing and then next to the blue job training center is the proposed habitat for humanity restore operation which would be a retail operation for selling new, nearly new reusable building materials to the public which would further our Green Vision and zero waste goals. And then a separate 7,000 square foot building that can you see marked HHW would be the new HHW facility. The nice thing about this design is the traffic will go around the perimeter of the site so it would enter down below and drop off with the residents wouldn't have to exit their car and then they'd exit at the top portion of the site. And then the traffic for the people using the restore and the CTDC and the job training operation wouldn't be impacted by the HHW traffic. One of the goals of the facility is to

have as significant three times as many events as we do now. So we want both the HHW operation and the CTDC restore operation to be heavily used. LEED certification, our goal for the building is LEED platinum. And the way we're getting at that because we're still coming up with our finalizing our funding sources for the construction, is we'll -- we're having the construction documents have the base designed for LEED silver which I think could probably be gold but Public Works is still here. And then we're doing add-alternates so as we identify more funding, we're able to add the elements of the design for us to go to LEED platinum. We're also shooting to get the construction documents out soon, to take advantage of the soft construction and bidding environment, and that will also help us if the bids come in less than expected for the base price, allow some add-alternates back into the site, that will get us back up to LEED platinum. We've incorporated several designs, sustainable design features both in the base design and in the add-alternates including photo voltaics, modular wet lance, pervious pavers, pavers, my favorite composting toilets, and additional sustainable features that are -- we'll be able to add in as funding becomes available. For the funding strategy, for this site, this is the same space construction cost that we brought to council in T&E last September, \$14.135 million. We did do an extensive I think it was ten-hour meeting in March with an engineering team to go through every, both external feature and structural component of the site to make sure we could stay within that \$14.135 million. And we were able to do that. So the -- we've got in the proposed budget that's going to you on 6-15 the 6.635 million as a reserve for the project that's the construction and demolition deposit money that we talked about last fall. The main thing we're waiting for is the economic development grant. And I'll discuss that in a minute. And then we also have a proposal to fund the household hazardous waste portion of the site with \$3.5 million from ESD's budget for '10-11. The pictures in the site are the entrance canopy and the PV carports that would be part of the add-alternate part of the design and then we also have the schematic design for the public art project which is a storm water project or the public art component of the site. For the household hazardous waste part of the facility, we were looking at a couple of options one including a loan. There were issues with that. We did determine it is significantly cheaper if we were just able to pay for the site than do a loan, pay for the household hazardous waste building. So we are recommending this funding strategy for that. \$2 million would be -- and that decision is going to council on June 22nd, part of the hauler negotiation contracts. The haulers have offered us to -- one of the haulers to provide us \$2 million upon execution of the contract extension. Then the savings from phase 1, the funds from a reimbursible grant we'll get from the State after phase 1 is completed, and then some additional funding ESD has identified in

its '10-11 budget. So components of that will be before council on June 22nd. The grant opportunities, we're aggressively pursuing several grant opportunities. These are grant opportunities we have pending. Also in the next 45 days there are four additional significant opportunities that our staff is getting ready to start writing proposals for from the California employment development department, the EPA and the California energy commission. These are proposals we've already submitted and we're waiting to hear about. And then in addition to that we've got the economic development administration proposal that I mentioned earlier. This is the one we're waiting for, to be once we get this we can go to council and be ready to get approval to move forward with the construction documents. We've been working with the EDA on this for about a year. They've come and done site visits, and the decision is currently pending in the regional Seattle office. And all signs are favorable but obviously it's not done until it's done. The biggest development that's happened on our project is the City's participation in a regional grant with we call EEREG, the energy efficiency building system grant. The city responded to a letter of interest from Lawrence Berkeley Labs for regional partners to apply for this grant. It's a \$130 million winner-take-all national grant for developing energy efficiency regional environmental clusters. Las Plumas was competitive with its letter of interest with Lawrence Berkeley labs because of its shovel-ready state. There were other cities that submitted environmental incubator concepts but we were the only one that had CEQA completed and had 50% construction documents done. So we were selected to be a partner and we submitted that grant in May, with Lawrence Berkeley labs and several other partners were involved in that and we're waiting to hear about that in the fall. The next steps, we'll be bringing to council a consideration for the majority of the HHW permanent facility funding as part of the hauler negotiations proposal on June 22nd. We're waiting to hear about the EDA and the EEREG grants, and we are in the meantime aggressively, the office economic development has been taking the lead in working with the EDA on getting a decision on that made as quickly as possible. We're planning to go out to bid for the construction in 2010 and then bring forward to council considerations about the organizational structure and kind of the O&M structure for the facility in summer 2011. And then complete the facility in 2012. We are bringing forward a proposal for council consideration to purchase the family supportive housing shelter across the street. This, we've been calling phase 3 of the project. It will enable us to move some of our operations which are in the current old warehouse across the street to the family shelter, and provide the family shelter the funds to move to their new location, construction move on Dobbin Drive. And with that we'll answer questions.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks, Jo. Any questions, comment?

>> Councilmember Chirco: That sounded really cool.

>> It is my favorite project.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Yeah, it is cool.

>> Councilmember Herrera: It looks great. It looks like -- can you just confirm that this, for those who are listening to this, that this is not -- we're not talking about using General Fund money or anything like that in terms of the development, and the O&M costs would not be borne by any general fund for the city?

>> Yes, that's correct.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Great work, great report.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Always love other people's money. Is there a motion?

>> Councilmember Herrera: Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I just wanted to point out one more extraordinary thing happening in district 3. Thank you. All right, all in favor? [Laughter]

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Sorry. Okay, that passes unanimously. We'll move on to the water pollution control plant master plan.

>> John Stufflebean: This is another cool thing and this is our master plan for the land around the plant. And the master planning at the plant there are kind of three elements to our process. One is the actual physical rebuilding of the plant. And we're not planning to talk about that today unless you want to talk about anaerobic digesters and grid chambers and stuff. But the second part of the plan is the land around the plant, the 2600 acres or so, that is owned by the city and the tributary agencies including Santa Clara. And as we've talked before some really interesting opportunities what to do with that land. And the third part is our public outreach, which we'll also talk about. And we wanted to come today again, and we made a verbal report because a couple of milestones have just been recently reached and we want to make sure that you're all aware of what's happening. So with that I'll just dive right into it. Here's our project time line. As you can see we started in 2008 and we spent a lot of time analyzing the data, looking at all the different aspects of the plant. 2009 we developed what we call conceptual alternatives, and that was kind of anything you can think of in terms of the plant's future and the land use. And we had a workshop last May, the first yellow workshop, and what we've been doing this year then is focusing in on really developing viability alternatives. In other words, we looked at all possibilities and said, okay, now what's really possible to do on this land. And we had the big event that just happened, the milestone event which was the community workshop, and it actually ended up being a series of five community workshops that took place in May. They were very well attended. Over 200 people attended. We got a lot of good feedback and we wanted to share with you what we presented at these workshops, and then some of the feedback we are getting as well from those. Back up one last time on that. Want to mention that we are then aiming to head back to T&E in December with kind of our final recommendation on what to do with the land for your consideration. So okay. So again today we'll talk about land use alternatives and the community outreach. So kind of start with this is a drawing you've seen before that shows the 2600 acres and kind of how it's divided up. Notice the operation there is 180 acres and then the biosolids which is the lagoons and drying beds is about 770 issues. This is the current use of land. Next slide, this is what we see as potentially the future use. And remember this is the future use. We're talking 20, 30, 40 years from now, not next year, this is the long-term plan. But what you've noticed is the operations area got a little bigger, we expanded a little bit to the East, a little more yellow to the East, and this is based on our technical analysis of what the ultimate needs might be for the plant. We also included that little purple area to the southeast, the AWTF, that's where the advanced water treatment facility will go that the district is building with our cooperation. The little brown area to the north is the waste to energy, that's the nine power

land that we talked about several times. And of course the big change you'll notice is the biosolids area has shrunk. So this assumes that over the period of this 30 years we will work towards getting out of the lagoons and drying bed business for the biosolids and go towards a smaller area needed for the biosolids operation. That will be more expensive but it will also then free up this land, eliminate a potential source of odor, allow for other things to happen around here. But I always want to make sure everyone understand, it will cost more and that's a decision we have to make very carefully and the timing of that also is important. So let's -- so what I wanted to kind of go through today quickly is the land use elements. What things did we consider for this land and then we have the three alternatives for you to look at in terms of what we shared with the public. So starting off with again we've divided these into three categories. The first one economic, second one, environmental and the third, social. So in terms of economic potential land uses one of them is obviously use of energy fields solar energy fields. I'm going to zip through these quickly. These were the presentations we used at the five workshops. Retail development is also another possibility. Certainly, retail development has the highest potential for generating revenue. But then there's the question of, what kind of retail is appropriate there is it competing with other retail and what is appropriate for this site. Third economic development alternative is light industrial. And this is one that we think it has some significant potential because there aren't a lot of places where there's a significant amount of land for a kind of a major facility to be built. So if someone comes along, we want to make sure there's something -- an idea would be, there would be something available at some point in time for light industrial to be placed at this location. Particularly clean tech type of light industrial is what we're looking at. Another economic option is office R&D. This is something that's pretty prevalent in the area. Obviously there's a demand for it. We could provide some additional land for office R&D in the plant lands. Again maybe potentially focus being on clean tech and water tech. And the fifth one is the concept of a clean water tech institute where there could be a nexus where different research would come together, different companies would come together and share their ideas and potentially collaborate and work on kind of advancing the science of technology with the plant. The plant is all about science and technology, and so it's kind of a nice -- we think it may be a nice coupling with that. Some of the environmental uses -- and I'll just kind of give you the -- this is the pictorial view. There's the concept of a marsh and mud flat which would be close to the bay. Of course some of this already exists in the area but we can certainly look at enhancing it. Second potential use is wetlands development. Third potential environmental use is riparian corridor. This is when we talk to the environmental community this is kind of one that's highest on their list

and this is more like trees and bushes along the riparian corridors. The plant is right next to Coyote creek, Guadalupe river is pretty close by and there were a couple of other riparian corridors that were there historically. There is the potential for restoring and refurbishing them. And then kind of moving on up another idea would be to build a lake, or lakes, a series of lakes using the effluent potentially as the water supply. Kind of the caveat we put here is that lakes are expensive to operate. And so before we would do that we would want to make sure we had the kind of funds in place to make sure that lake is operated properly. Okay, and then moving up into the uplands. This is what it is now. This is grasslands. This is where our goats and sheep are very happy on the uplands and it is also an owl habitat. Burrowing owl habitat is one of the most potentially important uses. Social uses, this is a potential for some parks, maybe even a regional park which is we hear from the kind of recreation folks is something that's very much in need in this area. Certainly we look at the plant is really ideally facilitated to connect some of the bay trails, bay trail would go across this site somewhere, and so we want to make sure we facilitate that. And obviously, we would be expanding the education center connecting with the education center that's already there. So then kind of the bottom line is, it's our vision of what we would be recommending is something that is something special. We see this as an opportunity to build something special and to have something that has a particular esthetic feel and appeal to it. So this is one thing that we like to emphasize. Okay, so in terms of economic benefits, just kind of wanted to review that one economic benefit of this land is obviously to provide jobs. And we think there's -- our analysis shows there's potential for 15,000 to 30,000 jobs to be ultimately housed or located on this plant land. Again, this is over a 20, 30, or longer period of time. There is obviously the potential to generate revenue and this could be in the form of lease payments. We're not proposing to sell the land but we could lease it long term and generate revenue from leasing it. That revenue I understand legally could be used to offset the plant costs or it could be used for the General Fund, straight to the General Fund. Mollie, you want to chime in on that?

>> San José's share of the revenue, yes.

>> John Stufflebean: San José's share of the revenue, thank you for clarifying that. San José's share of the revenue. Each city gets their share of the revenue based on their contribution to the plant. And another source of revenue of course is that it would be the taxes that would be generated for any uses on the land, whether property

tax and sales tax. And then finally, an economic event if it would be regional economic vitality, as we were to -- if this were a place where it would be an incubator for clean tech, that certainly could be a benefit, or if it's an area where there's recreation, that could then enhance the value of this, that could be an increase, economic vitality benefit. Okay, so now we get into our three alternatives, and we'll just go right on through them real quickly. We -- instead of naming them one, two, three, we gave them interesting names so people could remember them. And it's not that we're not saying that we are going to recommend one alternative versus two versus three. We use these alternatives as a mechanism to get feedback. So as we hear the feedback from the public and from our stakeholders and from you all, certainly, we'll be looking forward -- I think the final version will be a combination of the three, kind of the best features from all of them. But the first one we call back to the bay. This shows some of the features of it, and you can see where all the different elements are. Notice that the gray area, the future plant footprint, is the same in all three alternatives. We basically said obviously the plant is our core mission, we have to continue doing that. But in this alternative, the levee, which is the dash line, kind of in the middle that runs east and west, is furthest to the South. In other words, we've allowed the bay to move furthest of the South of the three alternatives. We've also put a lake feature right at the very bottom, down by 237, so you can actually see water from where the traffic is at 237. And then this one has the smallest amount of economic uses, about 300 acres of economic uses. And it's all focused right along the 237 corridor. So there was some retail, some light industrial, some R&D, all kind of focused right along the 237 corridor. So then -- and owl habitat is in three different locations. As you can see, there's renewall energy field, effluent pond, wetland and so on in various places on this alternative. Okay, the second alternative we call it necklace of lakes. And the reason for that is you can kind of see a necklace of lakes going entirely around the future plant footprint, the gray area. You request take the effluent and create the necklace of lakes, kind of an interesting feature. In this area you can see the development occurs not only along 237 but also the light industrial goes into what we call the back lands where the sludge drying beds are. So again that couldn't happen until we got into some other biosolids sludge federation like I said would have a cost to it. This expands economic uses from 300 to 400 acres, and as you can see it moves the levees a little further to the north creating some additional land, some additional wetland instead of it just being bay in this one. So that's kind of the main one and the owl habitat is all one location. So this is alternative 2. And then the third alternative is called riparian corridor, and as I mentioned before, this takes advantage of the Coyote creek on the very east side of the property, plus it develops two additional corridors, one kind of in the middle and

one on the west side, for additional riparian corridor, which again is very valuable. And this option has the highest economic use, 500 acres. So it continues along 237 plus expanded back lands use for light industrial. And again the shoreline in this one is furthest to the north. So this one creates the most land. So again, those are the three alternatives. At the workshops we went through them in more detail, broke down into work groups, and I'll have Jennifer give more details on that. One of the main messages in our workshops and also today is, this is about phasing, this isn't something that can happen overnight, and the two big elements of the phasing are odor control measures, that we think that to do some of these uses, especially having people so close, we'd have to spend some additional money to do some additional odor control. Brings up that first process of the plant is the primary tanks where the wastewater hasn't really been treated yet, they're uncovered. So the first thing you'd think about is maybe those things would need to be covered, which is a \$60 million project, six-oh-million-dollar project. And then the second issue is the biosolids processing, where again, for a lot of this development to occur, we need to move the biosolids to a different technology. So now I'm going to turn it over to Jennifer Garnett who will give us kind of a briefing on how the workshops went.

>> Thank you, John. Jennifer Garnett, communications manager for ESD. I'm going to talk about the workshops and the results and then give you an overview on our next steps. So we did -- as John said this was a major milestone for public input for this project and we hosted a series of six public meetings in the spring. One at the end of April with our community advisory group where we unveiled the land use alternatives for the first time. And then a series of five workshops held throughout the plant service area in May. We held one in Cupertino, one in Milpitas, one in Santa Clara, one in Alviso and one in Downtown San José. The format of the workshop was a presentation, and here in this photo you can see John there on the left giving a presentation at the Santa Clara workshop and then we asked people to go into breakout sessions where they had an opportunity to go to four separate stations and take a look at the land use alternatives, and hear more detail about them from staff and consultants that we had on site. So this is one of those break sessions where people were looking at the social land uses. And we had an opportunity at this point for them to ask more detailed questions and really engage with the staff that was present there. The results of the workshop were quite successful. We had about 250 people attend. Through the workshop vehicles themselves we had 130 of these workbooks completed. And at the time this presentation was developed, we had 114 workbook questionnaires completed online. That number has grown

to 160. So I'm pleased to report that we have now almost 300 questionnaires completed from members of the public. And this is the tool that we're using to collect information about the project itself both quantitatively and qualitatively. So there are a series of multiple choice questions as well as some open-ended opportunities. Another measure of success of the workshops was the media coverage that we gained. John and I worked quite closely with our key media outlets prior to the workshop to make sure that we got coverage timed in advance. And actually many members of the public showed up to the meetings with articles in hand from the Mercury News and the Milpitas post. And this is just a summary of the headlines from our major media outlets around the time of the workshops. So the workbook, I hope that you have a copy of it there. You can flip through it when you have time. But it's basically formatted around each of the land use alternatives. So there's a page or a spread here devoted to each of the four areas, economic, environmental, social and operational, and you can see the types of questions we were asking and then giving people an opportunity to provide open ended feedback. And they've done so, very well so far. We'll be collecting input on these workbooks through the end of June on our Website at www.rebuildtheplant.org. And at that time we'll be compiling all the information and coming back to the committee with a full report. In the meantime this gives you just a flavor for what we're hearing so far with our initial analysis so far. People have expressed interest in the clean tech institute. I think they particularly see the value in how that would be a regional asset and actually help to attract industry to the site. Many people have talked to us about how they recognize the synergy between the plant and the opportunities for waste to energy facilities. We've also heard resounding support for the preservation of habitat and open space, particularly for animals that are endangered, like the burrowing owl as John alluded to before, not just habitat for their nesting areas but also foraging areas. Trails, water, recreation and parks, we had a number of people who attended the workshops who were very interested in opening the land or the month recreational uses. Always, at any time you talk about a blending of uses, people were very concerned about mitigating traffic impacts, particularly when you talk about some of the industrial uses combined with more of the social uses. And finally because we are at a low level area, sea level rise protection continued to be a theme in people's comments that we've heard so far. Next steps. In the immediate future, is of course to fully analyze all of the feedback that we've received and we're doing this on an ongoing basis, through June when we stop collecting input on the workbooks. We're also going to go through the summer and do some very intense rounds with additional stakeholder outreach focusing on our businesses and our regulatory and resource agencies. We've

already had meetings scheduled with the Silicon Valley research group and the Water District. We've brought members of the chamber of commerce through the plant on a tour in the last few months and they're very interested in talking to us about the land use alternatives. So we will do that stakeholder outreach through the summer. We also have programmed in a midpoint survey in July so we're working on those questions now. This is a follow-up from our initial survey that we did at the outset of the project which really gave us quite a bit of information that helped shape some of our campaign work and some of the ways that we've gone out to seek input from the community. Finally our tour season has begun. In May we opened up tours to the 400 people that were on our waiting list from the last tour season and with our kickoff of tour season this June we've crossed the 7,000 mark. 7,000 people have come out to the treatment plant since we renewed tours in 2008. So that continues to be a draw and when people are out there they are understanding the infrastructure needs for that critical facility. With that open it up to any questions.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great, thank you very much for the presentation. Any questions or comments? Rose.

>> Councilmember Herrera: First of all, this is an impressive verbal report. I don't know what a written report would be. That's great. I was just curious on your various scenarios, which one would be the least sensitive to odor, how you'd rank them and then which one would be the most sensitive to odor. I'm guessing the one with the more uses, right, you'd have to make sure it's a higher grade?

>> John Stufflebean: The wind generally blows as the airplanes fly from the Northwest to the southeast. So any use that is to the southeast of the plant would tend to be more sensitive to odor. So those would be the uses where you'd -- if you'd have a lot of uses, especially outdoor use, you would be looking at potentially additional odor control at the plant. In all three areas there is development in that area, odor control, we feel it is a high probability of potentially covering the tanks and getting out of the biosolids is a long term proposition.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I have a comment about the institute. I think the idea of the institute, I don't claim to know all the details of that, but it sounds intriguing, we should be looking at whatever we put there should be a

regional attraction. I guess in my mind I'm kind of picturing that institute kind of like our slack -- our linear accelerator of the energy world you know, and if we could create something as intriguing as that with high powered research and science it could really draw interest from all over the region and could end up doing -- adding a lot to economic development more than just putting a target store or some of the other more mundane although economic development yes but I think that's the kind -- that's exactly the kind of innovative kind of really facility we should be looking at, is like the institute that's described here. That got me the most excited. And then also, I think looking at the natural environment there. And that preservation is very important too. But yeah, I'd like to see something innovative that really takes into account our ability to leverage that and make it something that will generate a lot of interest and activity.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Vice Mayor?

>> Councilmember Chirco: No.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All right, thank you both. We don't have any public comment on this item I don't believe, so we now have time for open forum. Bill. It's your last chance to campaign. Okay? Absolutely. And everyone get out there and vote tomorrow. The meeting is adjourned. I'm sorry.