

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Los Gatos Planning Commissioners:  
Melanie Hanssen, Chair  
Jeffrey Barnett, Vice Chair  
Kylie Clark  
Kathryn Janoff  
Steve Raspe  
Reza Tavana  
Emily Thomas

Town Manager: Laurel Prevetti

Community Development Director: Joel Paulson

Town Attorney: Robert Schultz

Transcribed by: Vicki L. Blandin  
(619) 541-3405

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S :

CHAIR HANSSEN: We will move onto Item 3, and that is review and make a recommendation on the Draft 2040 General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report to the Town Council.

I will remind the Commission the our role in this matter is to carefully consider all the materials received, including the input and recommendations of GPAC over 35 meetings, the Town Council, this Commission from a study session, and a couple of other Town Council meetings, to provide input to the Planning Commission, as well as a substantial amount of input from the public since 2018 when this process started, including in-person meetings and a workshop for communications at meetings, and multitudes of written communications.

We will be proceeding to make a recommendation to the Town Council on the General Plan and certification of a Final EIR. The Town Council is the final deciding body on both documents, and we will describe in more detail the procedure we will use to consider the General Plan after the completion of all verbal public comments, which will be taken for this meeting.

1           It is entirely possible that we will not finish  
2 our review during this meeting and may need to continue the  
3 meeting to complete our review. I will now turn it over to  
4 Staff for their report.

5           JENNIFER ARMER: Good evening, Chair, Vice Chair,  
6 and Commissioners. Jennifer Armer, Planning Manager. The  
7 item before you is the consideration of the Draft 2040  
8 General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report. I know  
9 we have all been looking forward to getting to this point  
10 in the process, but you now have the opportunity to discuss  
11 and prepare a recommendation to Town Council.  
12

13           First, for those in the audience who are joining  
14 us for the first time, this is an update to the existing  
15 2020 General Plan as a document that is updated every 10 to  
16 20 years. Every jurisdiction in California must have a  
17 General Plan, which is a local government's long-term  
18 framework or constitution for the future growth, services,  
19 and resource management.

20           The document before you is the result of  
21 extensive work over the last four years by the General Plan  
22 Update Advisory Committee, also known as the GPAC; the  
23 Planning Commission; Town Council; expert consultants;  
24 Staff from numerous departments; other agencies; and so  
25 many members of the public who have shared their questions

1 and concerns, praise and passion, in conversations and in  
2 writing to keep improving this document and this vision for  
3 the future of Los Gatos.

4           As part of this Staff presentation tonight, I  
5 want to share with you a few important points as a  
6 foundation for the discussion.

7           First, a reminder that this is a high-level  
8 policy document. It doesn't always get into the details  
9 that we're looking for, but those can be developed in other  
10 code or guideline documents or programs, and sometimes that  
11 is recorded in the General Plan as an implementation  
12 program.

13           While this discussion tonight will likely focus  
14 on a few specific components based on the written public  
15 comment that we've received, this document includes nine  
16 chapters covering a wide variety of topics. It has an  
17 Introduction with a Vision and Guiding Principles. It has a  
18 Racial, Social, and Environmental Justice Element, which is  
19 brand new for this Draft 2040 General Plan. It has the Land  
20 Use Element; Community Design Element; a reorganized  
21 Mobility Element; Public Facilities, Services, and  
22 Infrastructure Element; Open Space, Parks, and Recreation  
23 Element; Environment and Sustainability Element; and  
24 Hazards and Safety Element.  
25

1           What it does not include is an update to the  
2 Housing Element. That actually goes through a separate  
3 process that's on a different timeline. Instead of being  
4 updated every 10 to 20 years, as the full General Plan  
5 generally is, the Housing Element is on a state-mandated  
6 eight-year timeline for updates. We have actually just  
7 started that process and it depends on the capacity that is  
8 provided within the Land Use Element regulations.  
9

10           The most substantial changes in this Draft 2040  
11 General Plan from the 2020 General Plan include the new  
12 Racial, Social, and Environmental Justice Element; the  
13 increase in housing opportunities for mixed-use  
14 developments in some of our commercial areas, as well as  
15 missing middle housing in existing neighborhoods with  
16 design requirements; a new Community Commercial land use  
17 designation; new Community Place districts that provide  
18 more objective design standards and focus on community form  
19 or urban design for all development; shifts in focus of  
20 transportation policies to street design, connectivity, and  
21 mobility; reduction in vehicle miles traveled rather than  
22 just road capacity; new goals in the Environment and  
23 Sustainability Element; and expanded policies to prepare  
24 for wildfire, climate change, and community health threats.  
25

1           The Draft General Plan is still a draft, and we  
2 expect that the recommendation to Town Council from the  
3 Planning Commission will include modifications based on  
4 your review of the documents, the environmental review  
5 information provided, and further public input received  
6 since the June 2021 release of the Draft General Plan. We  
7 will continue to receive additional input as well. Written  
8 input will continue to be received until Town Council makes  
9 a final decision.

10  
11           These modifications can be made based on  
12 suggestions that have already been received, and  
13 recommendations. We do include a list, a summary of that  
14 and categorization by chapter in Exhibit 7. That's based on  
15 all public comment that has been received since June 2021,  
16 and it also includes some of the comments that were  
17 submitted on the Draft EIR, but actually include changes to  
18 the General Plan itself. Your modifications can also be the  
19 results of your review and consideration; they do not have  
20 to be prompted by public comment.

21           I'd also like to share specific points about the  
22 environmental review. This is a program Environmental  
23 Impact Report, which is different than a project EIR that's  
24 based on a specific project where you have a specific  
25 amount of development construction, a building that is

1 proposed, and so the process and the type of analysis is  
2 slightly different than most of the environmental review  
3 that you see at projects that come to the Planning  
4 Commission. The purpose of an EIR is to provide  
5 information, and so certification or recommendation to  
6 certify an EIR does not indicate approval of the project.

7           Unavoidable impacts, as there are for this EIR,  
8 are actually quite common with General Plans. A project  
9 plan of this level, especially in a community where we  
10 don't have any type of high-speed public transit, is likely  
11 to have unavoidable impacts in terms of vehicle miles  
12 traveled and greenhouse gases, and so this is actually  
13 something that we have seen on previous environmental  
14 review for previous General Plans as well.

15           One final point: the final decision on the 2040  
16 General Plan will be made by Town Council and will be the  
17 result of their deliberations and considerations,  
18 considering the recommendation from the GPAC, the  
19 recommendation from the Planning Commission, and any  
20 further comments received by the public, including written  
21 comments submitted after today's 11:00am deadline or after  
22 the completion of your deliberations.

23           This concludes Staff's presentation, but I'd be  
24 happy to answer any questions you have, and we do have  
25

1 consultants as well, so if there are questions that I can't  
2 answer that we want to get into some details, we can ask  
3 them.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Very good, and thank you for your  
5 presentation. I would like to take this time to commend  
6 Staff for the excellent support that they've given the GPAC  
7 over the last two-and-a-half years that the GPAC worked, as  
8 well as over the last year processing the EIR and  
9 collecting all the public comments and leading up into this  
10 time where the Planning Commission will be reviewing the  
11 General Plan and the EIR, and spent excessive time  
12 responding to every single letter that was received, which  
13 is part of the EIR process, and responding to them in  
14 detail about whether or not it required changes to the EIR  
15 or identified additional impacts, and then further went to  
16 take all of the hundreds and hundreds of comments which we  
17 appreciate and continue to encourage that came in since the  
18 GPAC stopped meeting back in May of last year, and was able  
19 to compile all of those comments and basically help us  
20 characterize them by element so that when we proceed  
21 through the review of the General Plan after public  
22 comments we can do so in much more of an orderly fashion,  
23 so I would like to thank Staff for that.  
24  
25

1 I will ask at this time if Commissioners have any  
2 questions for Staff before we begin our public comments?  
3 You will have other opportunities to talk and ask questions  
4 of Staff as we review the document. I don't see any hands  
5 raised.

6 Now we will turn to public comments. This is the  
7 time where we would take public comments on the General  
8 Plan as well as the Final EIR, and we ask any members of  
9 the public that wish to speak to limit their comments to  
10 three minutes, and this will be the only opportunity during  
11 the Planning Commission's review of the General Plan for  
12 verbal public comments to be made during the meeting. We  
13 will be taking all public comments at this moment in time,  
14 even if we have to continue the meeting to another meeting.  
15 We want to hear all public comments up front before we  
16 begin any discussion. So, I would like to see if there are  
17 people from the public who would like to speak.

18 I would like to add just one more comment, which  
19 is we totally appreciate any and all comments on the  
20 General Plan. One thing I did want to say is that as we  
21 review the General Plan and consider all of your comments,  
22 it's difficult for us to consider that many people have  
23 advocated for a no growth scenario, and while we on the  
24 GPAC as well as the Planning Commission all share the same  
25

1 concerns as you as residents of town, we are mandated by  
2 state law to adhere to providing and planning for housing.  
3 We don't actually build it, but we have to plan for housing  
4 in our Housing Element, and we have to start that process  
5 through the General Plan by having densities and land use  
6 standards that make it possible for developers to be able  
7 to build those things, so one thing we cannot consider is  
8 any scenario where there is zero growth in town, as much as  
9 everyone would like that to help things settle from the  
10 North Forty, but that being said, you're welcome to make  
11 any comments that you like related to the General Plan at  
12 this time.  
13

14 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair Hanssen. The  
15 first speaker will be Giulianna Pendleton.

16 GIULIANNA PENDLETON: Good evening,  
17 Commissioners. My name is Giulianna Pendleton and I'm a  
18 resident of Los Gatos and the Environmental Advocacy  
19 Assistant for Santa Clara Audubon Society. Thank you to  
20 Staff, the GPAC, and everyone who has put so much work into  
21 this General Plan update.  
22

23 Last year I advocated for a goal to be added to  
24 the General Plan Environment and Sustainability Element for  
25 a dark sky and bird safe design ordinance. I was excited  
that the GPAC agreed with protecting our natural night sky,

1 reducing artificial light at night, and protecting our  
2 birds, hundreds of millions of which die each year due to  
3 building or structure collisions related to artificial  
4 light at night. I hope you all support the inclusion of a  
5 dark sky and bird safe design ordinance in the General  
6 Plan.

7           Please also consider removing any goals or  
8 policies within the plan that would lead to over-lighting  
9 our town. Already, I have a bright street light outside my  
10 window that shines into my room each night, and I often  
11 drive by the Creekside Sports Complex that now has  
12 temporary lighting that is bright, unshielded, and on even  
13 when I don't see any players on the field.

14           Los Gatos can become a leader in responsible  
15 outdoor lighting, but in order to do so we need to include  
16 responsible uses of light in all of our planning  
17 guidelines.

18           Additionally, as you review and make  
19 recommendations on the Draft General Plan, please  
20 strengthen biodiversity protections, native habitat  
21 enhancement, and wildlife connectivity whenever possible.  
22 Right in our back yard the newts of Alma Bridge Road are  
23 dying at an alarming rate due to vehicles.  
24  
25

1           Whenever we think about transportation, from  
2 roads to slow streets to trails, we need to prioritize both  
3 human and wildlife safety and include safe wildlife  
4 crossings.

5           Thank you for your consideration and I look  
6 forward to watching how this General Plan will uplift both  
7 the humans of Los Gatos as well as the wildlife and native  
8 environment that also call Los Gatos home.

9           CHAIR HANSSSEN: Thank you for your comments. I'll  
10 ask if any Commissioners have a question for you? I have  
11 one, which is we appreciate all the comments that you've  
12 been making during the General Plan process, including now,  
13 and my question for you is, is there anything in your  
14 comments tonight that wasn't included in the written  
15 comments that you've already given us that we have in front  
16 of us to consider?

17           GIULIANNA PENDLETON: I think they are all  
18 consistent. My letters and written comments go into more  
19 detail of which goals and policies can be considered, but I  
20 think tonight's comments are more just broad, having to do  
21 with habitat connectivity, native plants, protections of  
22 our night sky, all the fun stuff. But thank you so much for  
23 all the work you've done. I've really enjoyed engaging in  
24 this process.  
25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you very much. Do any  
2 Commissioners have questions for Ms. Pendleton?  
3 Commissioner Clark has her hand up.

4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just put it up because I  
5 have a comment that was not a question for the commenter. I  
6 just wanted to say I don't think that we ever explicitly  
7 said to raise your hand if you want to make a comment, and  
8 I think we're all familiar enough with that process right  
9 now, but I figured that that's probably important to make  
10 sure the audience knows.

11 CHAIR HANSSEN: Oh, yes. The procedure, if you're  
12 on Zoom and you're online, you can click the Raised Hand  
13 feature in Zoom and that will let Staff know that you want  
14 to speak, and if you are participating by phone, it is \*9,  
15 is that correct, Staff? Yes, to participate by phone, and  
16 so I think those are the options that you need to be able  
17 to speak to us, because we certainly want to encourage  
18 anyone and don't want lack of knowledge of how to do that  
19 to be an impediment.

20 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. The next speaker  
21 will be Karen.

22 KAREN RUBIO: Good evening, and thank you for  
23 your hard work on the General Plan. My name is Karen Rubio  
24 and I've lived in Los Gatos for 37 years. I'm also a member

1 of local nonprofit Plant-Based Advocates, and I'm sure  
2 you've been hearing from us.

3           As a mother and environmentalist, I'm asking the  
4 Planning Commission and Town Council to take action to  
5 ensure a habitable planet for our children by including  
6 plant-based diet education into Section 8.12 of the General  
7 Plan.

8           On March 31<sup>st</sup> the Mercury News published my  
9 opinion piece entitled "It's Time for Californians to Talk  
10 About the Cow in the Room." In this article I explain how  
11 47% of California's water goes to meat and dairy production  
12 and how the livestock industry plays a key role in climate  
13 change. The planet's seven hottest years on record have  
14 happened in the last seven years, and in California the  
15 effects of climate change are inescapable.

16           We now know that raising livestock is a primary  
17 cause not only of global warming, but also land depletion,  
18 water scarcity, deforestation, pollution, and biodiversity  
19 loss. Shifting to a plant-based diet reduces foods-  
20 associated greenhouse gas emissions by as much as 73% and  
21 cuts in half the water needed to produce our food.  
22 Therefore, any plan to achieve a sustainable environment  
23 must include education about plant-based diets.  
24  
25

1           The latest report by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel  
2 of Climate Change has outlined the dire consequences if we  
3 fail to address runaway global warming. UN Secretary  
4 General Antonio Guterres has called the report "a code red  
5 for humanity. The alarm bells are deafening and the  
6 evidence is irrefutable."

7           For elected officials and community leaders, I ask you  
8 to take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as this  
9 could be the most important thing you'll ever do in your  
10 capacity as town leaders. Therefore, I hope the Planning  
11 Commission will support our request for programs to educate  
12 residents about the benefits of eating plant-based, and  
13 thank you for your time.

14           CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments and your  
15 continued education of all of us on the benefits of plant-  
16 based eating, and your comments, as well as those of your  
17 colleagues, are duly noted. Thank you. Are there any  
18 questions for Ms. Rubio from the Commission? Commissioner  
19 Tavana.

20           COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Just a quick question to Ms.  
21 Rubio. I just wanted to get her opinion on if the General  
22 Plan in the draft form is satisfactory to her and achieves  
23 her goals?

24           KAREN RUBIO: Thank you for that question. I know that  
25 the General Plan has incorporated some of our ideas, but

1 what it's lacking right now is a solid commitment toward  
2 educating residents about eating plant-based, and I just  
3 feel strongly that it's necessary, because that's largely  
4 absent today. In general education, kids are not taught it  
5 in schools. Doctors go through their entire education with  
6 less than seven hours of nutrition training, which is just  
7 unbelievable, and we're bombarded with marketing for meat  
8 and dairy companies. People still think dairy is good for  
9 you. It's not. So, yeah, that's why I feel like a solid  
10 education plan is necessary, and thank you for asking.

11 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Thank you.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Thomas has a question for  
13 you as well.

14 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Just as a follow up to  
15 Commissioner Tavana's question, Ms. Rubio. I just want to  
16 clarify that you want a plant-based diet education program  
17 added as an implementation program attached to Section  
18 8.12?

19 KAREN RUBIO: Yes, exactly. Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you.

21 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett has a question for  
22 you as well.

23 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Ms. Rubio, thank you for your  
24 comments. The question I have is if the General Plan  
25 incorporates a requirement for a plant-based education

1 program, what would that mean in terms of actual  
2 implementation, specifics that you'd be looking for the  
3 Town to perform?

4 KAREN RUBIO: Thank you, that's a great question. Our  
5 group has been in existence for almost three years, but we  
6 became a nonprofit last year. We've actually submitted an  
7 entire program to the town with separate line items  
8 detailing what education could look like, so we've already  
9 done that. I guess basically what we're looking for is a  
10 commitment by the Town, and then the process of  
11 implementing it can be another discussion, but we certainly  
12 have a lot of great ideas on how to do that.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments, and it  
14 sounds like you've already made some other presentations,  
15 but my question for you is did you know that in addition to  
16 the General Plan, which is general and over a 20-year time  
17 horizon, you also have the opportunity to go directly to  
18 the Town Council? I believe you may have already done, but  
19 I wanted to make sure that you knew that might be a more  
20 immediate way to ensure in addition to what we're doing in  
21 the General Plan?

22 KAREN RUBIO: Yeah, thank you, Chair Hanssen. We have  
23 been doing that. In fact, in 2019 in December the Town  
24 Council adopted the Green Monday resolution. It's a  
25 wonderful, wonderful thing, however we feel that we need

1 more than that. It denotes the Town's commitment to plant-  
2 based, but it doesn't have, I guess, the necessary means to  
3 implement any educational programs.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, thank you for that. Any other  
5 questions for Ms. Rubio? I don't see any Commissioners'  
6 hands up, so the next speaker.

7 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, and the next speaker will be  
8 Lisa.

9 LISA WADE: Hello, my name is Lisa Wade. I'm also with  
10 Plant-Based Advocates, and I've lived in Los Gatos for over  
11 30 years. I wanted to thank you for your hard work on the  
12 General Plan and let you know that we appreciate your  
13 efforts.

14 I wanted to draw your attention to a petition that we  
15 submitted. This petition has 265 signatures asking for a  
16 plant-based education program in the General Plan. We have  
17 the names of 225 residents of Los Gatos, including  
18 community and business leaders who live in Los Gatos, and  
19 in addition we have the names of 40 residents who live in  
20 neighboring towns and cities, including Saratoga, Monte  
21 Sereno, and Campbell, who frequent Los Gatos businesses.

22 We also have the support of 11 groups, including local  
23 groups and health and environmental NGOs, including the  
24 Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter and the Center for  
25 Biological Diversity.

1           In addition, prominent citizens both in Los Gatos and  
2 neighboring cities, such as Lucas Ramirez, who is the Vice  
3 Mayor of Mountain View, and Alison Hicks, who is a City  
4 Council member in Mountain View, support our efforts, and  
5 they have a program in Mountain View that we would like to  
6 see something similar.

7           We have written testimony from the Center for  
8 Biological Diversity in support of our request, and we also  
9 had some verbal testimony from Dashiell Leeds from the Loma  
10 Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club who spoke and gave verbal  
11 comments at an earlier GPAC meeting last year or the year  
12 before in support of our initiative.

13           In addition, the Planning Commission and the Council  
14 have received numerous emails from Los Gatos residents  
15 requesting a plant-based education program to be added to  
16 the Environmental section of the General Plan. Like we  
17 said, we'd like to see this added to Section 8.12, and it  
18 could be something simple, just a few sentences. The  
19 verbiage could be something like, "To implement programs to  
20 educate and support residents about the benefits of  
21 shifting to plant-based diets, which include curbing  
22 greenhouse gas emissions, reducing biodiversity loss and  
23 deforestation, reducing water usage, and reversing  
24 pollution of our land, water, and air.

25

1           As Karen said, we did submit suggestions. I'll just  
2 give a few, like cooking classes, speaker series,  
3 informational brochures, and there are many other examples.  
4 It's really important that we include such a program,  
5 because numerous peer-reviewed scientific studies agree  
6 that plant-based eating is the most effective way for an  
7 individual to help the planet. For this reason, any plan to  
8 address climate and sustainability should include the  
9 promotion of plant-based eating. We have already provided  
10 you with the studies, and we're happy to provide them  
11 again.

12           Please do not leave out this powerful, cost-effective  
13 solution and add a plant-based education program to Section  
14 8.12. This section would not be complete without such a  
15 program.

16           I also wanted to say quickly before I leave that  
17 Plant-Based Advocates supports the dark skies and the bird  
18 safety, and also the wildlife safety and crossings that  
19 were mentioned earlier. Thank you.

20           CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you. Commissioners might have  
21 questions for you, and I see that Commissioner Raspe has  
22 his hand up.

23           COMMISSIONER RASPE: Thank you, Chair, and thank you,  
24 Ms. Wade, for your comments. Two quick questions.

25

1           The first is you're asking that the plant-based  
2 education program be added as an element to the General  
3 Plan. Are you aware of, or do you have any knowledge of,  
4 any other municipalities having similar components of their  
5 general plans that we could refer to?

6           LISA WADE: Yes, I know that Mountain View has such a  
7 component, and I know that other cites have initiatives.  
8 I'm not sure exactly if it's in their general plans, but I  
9 know that Berkeley has a pretty strong initiative. I'm not  
10 as familiar with it as Karen is, but I know we can submit  
11 information on that. In New York City, Mayor Eric Adams has  
12 introduced some things like Vegan Fridays where they serve  
13 vegan food in the schools, and if kids want something that  
14 is not vegan they have to actually request it so that the  
15 default is vegan. He's also opened a bunch of health  
16 centers to provide education to the public about how plant-  
17 based diets can help with health. I could send you those  
18 articles as well, if you're interested.

19           COMMISSIONER RASPE: Great. Thank you so much, Ms.  
20 Wade, for answering that question.

21           My second follow up question is just a favor. You gave  
22 us some language that you thought might be useful for us as  
23 an introduction into the General Plan, and if you send  
24 these other materials, just send those to the Town as well  
25

1 so we have that for our records. I would appreciate that.  
2 Thank you so much.

3 LISA WADE: I definitely will. Thank you.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. Just to address  
5 Commissioner Raspe's question, yes, we did receive comments  
6 and suggestions in a fair amount of detail from the  
7 Advocates, including Ms. Wade, for plant-based eating  
8 education, so I think we'll have everything we need to  
9 consider in terms of the General Plan review when we get to  
10 that.

11 Are there other members of the public that would like  
12 to speak on the General Plan or the Final EIR for the  
13 General Plan?

14 JOEL PAULSON: Yes, thank you, Chair. The next speaker  
15 will be Jack.

16 JAK VANNADA: Good evening, Honorable Chair and  
17 Planning Commission. Jak Vannada from the Los Gatos  
18 Community Alliance.

19 The GPAC had been informed that a Town consultant and  
20 the Department of Finance for the State of California don't  
21 believe that the Town of Los Gatos will grow more than  
22 1,954 households in 20 years. My question is why would the  
23 GPAC double that number to 3,738? If you subtract the  
24 maximum build-out of 1,954 from 3,738, that's 1,784  
25 overbuilt homes. I don't understand that.

1           We advocate a major effort by the Town to provide  
2 affordable housing. In fact, we have consistency said that  
3 the efforts of the HEAB should be focused on the low- and  
4 very-low categories that total 847 units. We know that it's  
5 going to be a major challenge in a built-out town with such  
6 high land costs. However, at the April 6<sup>th</sup> study session we  
7 heard from two affordable housing developers that though  
8 this is a challenge, it could be done.

9           We encourage you to push forward with Eden, Core, or  
10 like companies to focus on the challenge of getting more  
11 affordable housing into Los Gatos. However inclusive we  
12 think we are as a town, we do not have many who would be  
13 classified in the low- or very-low income levels. To attain  
14 more inclusivity the Town and the citizens will have to  
15 make monumental efforts to create truly affordable housing  
16 for the low- and very-low categories.

17           If you recall, the panelist's conversation about a  
18 point system to obtain financing, in addition to mass  
19 transit the buildings need to be tall and located close to  
20 shopping and amenities. Affordable housing is possible, but  
21 it will require a large creative effort by the Town,  
22 particularly by HEAB, in addition to a mindset change  
23 within our entire community.

24           Inclusivity will grow positively with the addition of  
25 affordable housing to the community. Remember that

1 inclusivity is a Council priority. The HEAB needs to find  
2 the locations, but that may be the easiest part of this  
3 equation. Financing and mindset changes will be covered,  
4 and with the no net loss rule it's only going to add to the  
5 challenge.

6 We strongly encourage the Planning Commission to stick  
7 with the state RHNA number of 1,993, plus the buffer. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for all of your comments and  
10 all of the written comments that you and the Los Gatos  
11 Community Alliance have submitted. I would like to ask the  
12 Commissioners if they have any questions for you at this  
13 time? I don't see any hands raised, but thank you again,  
14 and we do have all of your comments included in our Staff  
15 Report.

16 Is there anyone else that would like to speak on the  
17 General Plan or the Final EIR?

18 JOEL PAULSON: Yes, thank you, Chair. The next speaker  
19 will be Lee Quintana.

20 LEE QUINTANA: First I'd like to comment that I'm  
21 somewhat surprised that the public is limited to three  
22 minutes for the entire General Plan and the EIR. That's  
23 amazing to me. I think each element should have been  
24 allowed separate comments. The EIR is a separate document  
25

1 and a separate vote; that should be also given it's own  
2 time. However, that's not going to happen.

3 I would like to say that as a member of GPAC I voted  
4 to recommend that the Draft General Plan go ahead to the  
5 Planning Commission, but I want to emphasize that I also  
6 placed on the record that I did not agree to the current  
7 form of it. I have many, many problems with this General  
8 Plan and its format.

9 One of the problems I have is the manner in which GPAC  
10 was conducted. We had very little leeway in recommending or  
11 changing anything. We were given the background documents  
12 already written. I could make comments on it, but we  
13 couldn't make any recommendations of changes to them.  
14 Basically one of the biggest flaws of the whole process, I  
15 believe, is that the General Plan base map was never  
16 reviewed for consistency between the General Plan and the  
17 Zoning code and those two being brought into consistency  
18 with each other. We were not given the ability to recommend  
19 new General Plan categories or even...

20 Let me go back. I'm very emotional about this. The  
21 alternatives that we were given for the preferred  
22 alternative essentially was simply one alternative, which  
23 was keep the General Plan categories the way they are and  
24 where they are, and then we were given four variations of

25

1 that based on the number of units and the intensities and  
2 densities being changed uniformly across the whole town.

3 I firmly believe that we need to first decide what  
4 areas we wish to preserve as they are limited, what areas  
5 we consider transitional that we want to see some change  
6 in, and we have to identify clearly those areas that we  
7 want to see the major changes in. As is currently stated,  
8 we have minimums and maximums in a lot of the categories  
9 along Los Gatos Boulevard and other places being able to  
10 use a mixed-use configuration, minimum/maximum for density,  
11 but it's not clear to me that that minimum density is  
12 required even though the intensities of the development are  
13 being increased.

14 There are no incentives that I can see in this General  
15 Plan to help get the type of housing we want: smaller  
16 units. It's almost wishful thinking. There are too many  
17 terms used in the policies to really give true and clear  
18 direction. Very few of them say, "shall" or "should." To  
19 me, we're creating a Humpty Dumpty where we have this  
20 document, we don't really know what it says, and when it  
21 comes down the line for some changes, maybe down the line  
22 to the zoning code, it is going to be the Staff's  
23 interpretation of what that means. Alison said that, "It  
24 means what I say it means," and sometimes that's not what  
25 the general public thinks.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Ms. Quintana, I saw Director Paulson  
2 had his hand up, so I'm going to have to ask you to stop,  
3 but I understand your frustration and I would encourage you  
4 also to send in written comments that you have, as it will  
5 be helpful to everyone on the Planning Commission as well  
6 as the Town Council as we're reviewing the document. I'll  
7 ask if any Commissioners have any questions for you,  
8 because it looks like you had more to say. I don't see  
9 anyone with their hands raised, so again, thank you for  
10 your input.

11 LEE QUINTANA: We spent 20 minutes talking about  
12 plant-based diet, but we can't talk about what going on in  
13 the General Plan?

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: I thank you for your input as well in  
15 the process. I'm not sure what we could do to adjust the  
16 process in the meeting, but certainly we can talk to Staff  
17 after we conclude this meeting if there is some other way  
18 that we can proceed going forward that would be more  
19 equitable for everyone.

20 With that, it looks like there are others that want to  
21 speak, so who will be next, Director Paulson?

22 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. The next speaker will  
23 be Matt.

24 MATT FRANCOIS: Good evening, Chair Hanssen and  
25 members of the Planning Commission. My name is Matt

1 Francois with Rutan & Tucker. My firm is the land use  
2 counsel for Los Gatos Community Alliance.

3 I wanted to start off by first thanking all of you for  
4 your service to your community. I, too, served on a  
5 planning commission and now serve on a city council and I  
6 understand the time commitment and the commitment that you  
7 have to your community that it takes to do something like  
8 this, so thank you for that.

9 As you're aware from some of the correspondence that  
10 we've submitted, LGCA has concerns with the proposed plan  
11 and the EIR, and to summarize those concerns: The proposal  
12 significantly and seemingly indiscriminately up-zones  
13 almost the entire town, including low-density residential  
14 neighborhoods and your very charming and unique downtown.  
15 The impacts of the changes are not studied in the EIR,  
16 however, as required by CEQA. The EIR studied only a small  
17 fraction of the growth enabled by the land use changes by  
18 applying what we believe are unreasonable and unsupported  
19 assumptions about the amount of growth that would ensue.  
20 Most of the changes to the residentially designated lands  
21 would not even count for the Town's requirement to plan for  
22 affordable housing units.

23 Also of importance is major intensification is not  
24 needed to satisfy market demand or the Town's new RHNA  
25 figure. If the proposed plan is approved in its current

1 form, the Town could not legally deny a project that  
2 complied with the new density standards.

3 We believe that the Town should focus first on the  
4 mandatory changes to its Housing Element, which are due in  
5 just a short six months from now, in January 2023. The  
6 Housing Element will provide critical information as to  
7 where and at what densities housing should be located. In  
8 my experience, that's what every other agency in the Bay  
9 Area is doing.

10 If the Town nonetheless proceeds with the proposed  
11 plan, the Commission should recommend that it be amended to  
12 provide for no more than 2,300 units. This meets the Town's  
13 stated goals of satisfying market demand and the Town's new  
14 RHNA number, plus a reasonable buffer. On page 6 of the  
15 Staff Report Staff outlines changes that could be made to  
16 achieve this reduction. LGCA supports those changes.

17 A general plan is a community's constitution for  
18 development. It deserves careful consideration and  
19 scrutiny. LGCA welcomes your engagement on these important  
20 matters, and I would be happy to answer any questions that  
21 members of the Commission may have.

22 CHAIR HANSSEN: We thank you for your comments and  
23 your many written comments that you have given to the  
24 Commission so far, and we do have all of them in our Staff  
25

1 Report, and so I will ask if any Commissioners have any  
2 additional questions at this time? Vice Chair Barnett.

3 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Thank you for your presentation,  
4 Mr. Francois. The question I have is I believe you're  
5 saying that the Town would not be able to down-zone once it  
6 is up-zoned, and I was wondering if that position is based  
7 on any particular statute or other (inaudible)?

8 MATT FRANCOIS: Thank you, Commissioner Barnett. Yes,  
9 it's based on the Housing Accountability Act, which states  
10 essentially once an agency is planned and zoned for a  
11 certain density of units, if a developer comes in with a  
12 project that is at that stated density, that law doesn't  
13 entirely prohibit but it greatly restricts the Town's  
14 ability to deny that project.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Does that answer your question, Vice  
16 Chair Barnett.

17 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes, it did, thank you.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Are there any other Commissioners that  
19 have questions? Commissioner Raspe.

20 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Thank you, Chair, and thank you,  
21 Mr. Francois for both your presentation this evening and  
22 your correspondence to the Council.

23 You mentioned that you would appreciate a target of  
24 2,300 units and would accept the six different criteria  
25 that appear on page 6 of the Staff Report. With respect to

1 those six criteria, do you feel equally strongly about each  
2 of those, or are there some that you would prefer or feel  
3 more strongly about as opposed to others? Thank you.

4       MATT FRANCOIS: I appreciate the question,  
5 Commissioner Raspe, and I just want to reiterate that  
6 obviously we're not in the position of micromanaging your  
7 General Plan update. That's a community update that the  
8 Commission and the Council weigh in on, but the one that is  
9 very important to LGCA is the increased densities in the  
10 low-density residential, to reducing those densities to  
11 what they are in the current General Plan, which are up to  
12 five units per acre. The new plan would allow for up to 12  
13 units per acre on those lands.

14       Another important change that was made that we would  
15 wish the Commission to weigh in on is the significant up-  
16 zoning of your Central Business District, your downtown  
17 area where the floor area ratios and housing densities are  
18 being increased by 200%.

19       COMMISSIONER RASPE: Thanks for your response.

20       CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that, and do any other  
21 Commissioners have questions for Mr. Francois? Again, we do  
22 have all of your comments for consideration when we do our  
23 review, but we thank you for your verbal comments as well.  
24 Who else would like to speak on the General Plan or the  
25 Final EIR?

1           JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. The next speaker will  
2 be Gina.

3           GINA: Hi, thank you, everyone. I just really wanted  
4 to show my support for some of the other speakers.

5           I'm really particularly passionate about the wildlife  
6 crossings, if we could get wildlife crossings to protect  
7 the newts and the deer and just in general protecting  
8 wildlife in any way possible, as well as protecting our  
9 open spaces.

10          I also agreed with the first speaker on the dark  
11 skies, just in general protecting biodiversity and the bird  
12 safety.

13          In general I wanted to voice my agreement with  
14 protecting the environment and reducing all sorts of  
15 pollution and greenhouse gases.

16          I agreed with the other speaker on including the  
17 education for plant-based diet. I thought that sounded  
18 great.

19          I also would much more agree with the approximately  
20 2,000 units versus the 4,000 units. I'm as much as possible  
21 against the high-density and up-zoning.

22          Back to the environment, I don't know if they're still  
23 doing this, but it seems like at Vasona and different  
24 places were spraying a lot of pesticides, which is really  
25 devastating to the monarch butterfly population, which we

1 have a migration through here, so if there is any way that  
2 we could reduce or eliminate the pesticides altogether, I  
3 think that would be great. So, that's it. Thank you for  
4 listening.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for all of your comments,  
6 and I will ask if any of the Commissioners have questions  
7 for you? I don't see any hands raised, but thank you once  
8 again for your comments.

9 Who else would like to speak on the General Plan or  
10 the Final EIR?

11 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. The next speaker will  
12 be Connie.

13 CONNIE HAMRAH: Good evening, my name is Connie  
14 Hamrah. I live in Los Gatos, and have been a resident of  
15 Monte Sereno and Los Gatos for over 44 years.

16 I guess one of my concerns is maintaining the  
17 integrity and the beauty, obviously, of the Town of Los  
18 Gatos, and with all of the proposed changes and the things  
19 that have been mandated from the state, how does water play  
20 into all of this?

21 In other words, we can plan all of these great things,  
22 and we all see all the building and construction going on  
23 in our area and throughout Santa Clara Valley, and yet, we  
24 don't have enough water. How are you addressing that in  
25 terms of the continued growth of the Town?

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: We thank you for your comments, but  
2 the format of our public hearings is that we can't answer  
3 your questions directly. We can ask you questions. But  
4 certainly there are sections of the General Plan as well as  
5 the EIR that do address water, and if you have more direct  
6 questions you can send them in to Staff and they can get  
7 back to you.

8 CONNIE HAMRAH: Okay, thank you. And then I would just  
9 agree that to keep the number of units to be added to our  
10 community at the lowest level possible I think would be  
11 appreciated by most of the people who live in our beautiful  
12 community, because we'd like to keep it that way, as I know  
13 you want to too, so thank you.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you very much. Any questions for  
15 the speaker? I don't see any hands raised. Then who would  
16 be the next speaker?

17 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. The next speaker will  
18 be Rosilene.

19 ROSILENE MARTINS: Hi, I just wanted to voice my  
20 opinion in regard to three of the topics.

21 First one being the plant-based education, I want to  
22 say that I support the plant-based education program even  
23 though I am not a vegan. I have reduced my consumption of  
24 meat because I believe also that the plant-based diet helps  
25 the planet in many ways, but especially by drastically

1 reducing greenhouse gas emissions and saving water, which  
2 is really important. So, since we all benefit from it we  
3 should all be supporting plant-based diet initiatives  
4 regardless of what we eat.

5 I also want to support the dark sky petition that was  
6 made earlier. I also have a terribly bright light that  
7 shines into my bedroom, and it is unfortunately really  
8 close to a creek, so it is really terrible I think in  
9 planning expanding so much housing into Los Gatos, because  
10 we need to keep this in mind, because we really have a lot  
11 of birds, and this wildlife is one of the things that gives  
12 Los Gatos its character, its charm, and we should really do  
13 as much as possible to preserve that.

14 In regard to the planning for expansion, I'm a Los  
15 Gatos resident for close to 30 years now and I was very  
16 involved in the discussions of the North Forty, and one  
17 thing that really puzzles me is that the North Forty was  
18 started with a proposal to address the affordable housing,  
19 and that was the main sale point of North Forty, and once  
20 the project kicked off this was not upheld and I think that  
21 this is a terrible thing that happened to the North Forty.  
22 Once the project kicked off the affordable housing quota  
23 that they were supposed to satisfy fell through the cracks,  
24 and I want to know in moving forward with this proposal,  
25 because we need to build more houses and we need to

1 increase density in Los Gatos to satisfy the government  
2 requirements for affordable housing, who is accountable to  
3 make sure that what happened with the North Forty is not  
4 going to happen again in the next development that is  
5 proposed under the guise of satisfying affordable housing  
6 in Los Gatos?

7 I see you guys are here to represent the Los Gatos  
8 residents, and I am hoping that these meetings and these  
9 discussions will boil down to plans that are advanced by  
10 your team that really satisfy what Los Gatos residents want  
11 and are asking for. Thank you for listening.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments. We truly  
13 appreciate your comments, and as I mentioned earlier, we  
14 can't directly answer your questions, but feel free to  
15 reach out to staff if you want specific answers for your  
16 questions. I'm quite sure that the Commission will be  
17 discussing some of this as we do proceed forward with our  
18 discussion on the General Plan, and some of what you talked  
19 about. The Housing Element Advisory Board is specifically  
20 working on locations, and levels of affordability will be  
21 addressed in their work as well. Do any Commissioners have  
22 questions for Ms. Martins? I don't see any, so thank you  
23 again for your comments, and who will be our next speaker?

24 JOEL PAULSON: The next speaker will be Catherine.  
25

1           CATHERINE SOMERS: Good evening, Planning Commission.  
2 My name is Catherine Somers and I'm the Executive Director  
3 at the Los Gatos Chamber of Commerce. It's great to be here  
4 tonight. I, too, actually support the dark skies, but more  
5 importantly, I just wanted to share something with you.

6           I get criticized a lot actually in my job for not  
7 really looking out for all of the commercial hubs in Los  
8 Gatos, and so it's kind of an interesting conundrum,  
9 because as much as I try to branch out and go out to Kings  
10 Court and introduce the Chamber to some of the folks out  
11 there, or out to now it's the North Forty, and to anywhere  
12 along the Boulevard, or out the Belgatos neighborhood or  
13 Harwood, I'm always having a hard time really bringing  
14 those people into the fold of Los Gatos. I think one of the  
15 really important things that you guys have on your plate  
16 is—we talk about inclusivity a lot—how to wrap those  
17 communities into the whole and yet make them really special  
18 and unique in and of themselves that they serve their  
19 individual neighborhoods.

20           It's a huge challenge that I'm throwing at you, but I  
21 would love to see reflected in the General Plan something  
22 to that. I think that involves the Land Use Element of  
23 course, or the land use portion of the General Plan. I  
24 think actually Lee Quintana was even kind of talking to  
25 this.

1           And so it's a big responsibility for you guys, but I  
2 think it's also a really unique opportunity that you have  
3 right now to look from above, a bird's eye view looking  
4 down, and what will make Los Gatos special 20 years from  
5 now when you look at the different neighborhoods and what's  
6 going to be that community hub? Maybe it is mixed-use  
7 housing in those community hubs, or mixed-use developments.

8           But I hope you'll take that into consideration when  
9 you look through the plan and at the EIR and everything  
10 else that you're looking at, and think of the Chamber of  
11 Commerce when you're doing it and how we can really all be  
12 part of the fabric of this community and all add to it and  
13 all benefit our individual neighborhoods. Thank you.

14           CHAIR HANSSEN: We thank you for all your service to  
15 our community in your capacity, and for your comments as  
16 well tonight. Do any Commissioners have questions for Ms.  
17 Somers? I don't see any hands raised, but I would like to  
18 ask a question. Have you had an opportunity to see our  
19 draft Community Design Element where we actually go into a  
20 fair amount of detail in the Draft General Plan about  
21 different neighborhoods across town and how we'd like to  
22 see them evolve toward 2020? There's actually a before and  
23 after for each one of those. Have you see that part of the  
24 plan yet?

25

1           CATHERINE SOMERS: Yes, I have, and actually I'm  
2 encouraged by what I've been seeing. I get a little  
3 concerned about the potential of up-zoning all throughout  
4 town, because I would really like to encourage you and all  
5 of us to focus our efforts on developing certain areas,  
6 again, to make them unique and special and not just do that  
7 to the whole town. So, yes, I really like what I've seen so  
8 far, what you planned. Thank you.

9           CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you. Are there others that would  
10 like to speak on the General Plan or the EIR?

11          JOEL PAULSON: Yes, thank you, the next speaker is  
12 Jesus.

13          JESUS: Yes, thank you. Good evening, Commission  
14 Members. I'm a property owner of a property at the cross-  
15 section of Los Gatos Boulevard and Farley Road. I don't  
16 know if you know where that is, but the property is  
17 actually on Los Gatos Boulevard. This is in regard to the  
18 General Plan zoning map, and right now that property is  
19 part of Santa Clara County and is zoned for Administrative  
20 and Professional Office use.

21          I was trying to have the building upgraded and updated  
22 into having medical and dental facilities, as it is  
23 currently very old and whatnot and it does serve the  
24 surrounding community in that area, and if we were to get  
25 annexed into Los Gatos it would be zoned for residential.

1 If you ever look at the zoning map on that area, it just so  
2 happens that that one commercial property, if it was part  
3 of Los Gatos, would be zoned as residential. I think it is  
4 just a technicality in terms of how it is, because for all  
5 the years that it's been there it's been a professional  
6 office building and it's been used as such for over the  
7 last 35 years, as I understand it.

8 So, please consider thinking about the zoning in that  
9 area. It is already in a Commercial area and it is just, in  
10 my opinion, a technicality that would stop us from  
11 renovating and updating the facility, the road, that  
12 corner, and providing services for the surrounding area,  
13 which includes the Town of Los Gatos. Thank you.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you very much for your comments.  
15 Could I ask you a favor to write up your specific concern  
16 and send it in to Staff? We do actually have in our Staff  
17 Report one suggestion from Staff about a particular  
18 property to be rezoned from a General Plan designation  
19 perspective, so please do send that in so we can make sure  
20 it's accounted for, because doing it in verbal comments  
21 will not get the result that we need without sending it to  
22 Staff. Ms. Armer has her hand up.

23 JENNIFER ARMER: Yes, I do believe that it is one and  
24 the same property that he is speaking to, which is included  
25 in your list of potential changes for consideration.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: So, that's the address that I saw in  
2 there. Okay, very good, so then I think we're covered. Do  
3 any Commissioners have questions for Jesus? I don't see any  
4 hands up, so are there others that would like to speak on  
5 the General Plan or the Final EIR?

6 JOEL PAULSON: Yes, thank you, Chair. The next speaker  
7 will be Arvin.

8 ARVIN: Yes, good evening, and thank you for your  
9 community service. I know it's late; I just have a very  
10 quick comment here.

11 I would like to suggest that the plan consider turning  
12 the downtown Santa Cruz Avenue into a pedestrian road. I  
13 think that would allow for Los Gatos residents and others  
14 to come to town, support the downtown businesses, and  
15 socialize. I don't know if it's in the plan right now, but  
16 I just wanted to make that recommendation. Thank you.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments. There is  
18 something to that effect in our comments. Do any  
19 Commissioners have questions for Arvin? Commissioner  
20 Thomas.

21 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Hi, yes, I do have a question  
22 for the speaker. I saw this as one of the comments, and  
23 Staff did not recommend adopting this, but I was curious if  
24 you would be happy with an implementation program that  
25

1 asked the question and went into studying the validity and  
2 ability to do this? Would you be happy with that?

3 ARVIN: Yeah, I'd be happy with anything that would  
4 make the Los Gatos downtown a little bit livelier, that  
5 instead of people going to other places they actually stay  
6 in Town and spend their money locally. I'm not a business  
7 owner in the downtown, so it's not a self-interest issue,  
8 but even if just a section of Santa Cruz Avenue could allow  
9 for people to enjoy a little bit nicer, rather than having  
10 concrete blocks in a way that doesn't really look very  
11 nice.

12 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay, thank you for answering  
13 that.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Do any Commissioners have any  
15 additional questions for the speaker? I don't see any hands  
16 raised, and so are there any others that would like to  
17 speak on this General Plan or the Final EIR?

18 I wanted to reiterate at this point, since I don't see  
19 any hands raised at the moment, that all of the public  
20 comments that we're taking for the verbal part of this—  
21 certainly written comments can continue to be made—will be  
22 taken this evening.

23 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. Yes, the next speaker  
24 will be Tony.

25

1           TONY ALARCON: Hello. Good evening, everyone. This is  
2 Tony Alarcon. I first moved to Los Gatos in 1991. I moved  
3 to Los Gatos from Willow Glen specifically for the Town  
4 culture, the hillside views, and the trails. I think it's  
5 important in the General Plan moving forward that we  
6 consider the reasons that many of us moved here.

7           Personally, if I were on the Commission or the Town  
8 Council I would have appealed the RHNA numbers provided by  
9 the state to Los Gatos. I do not support exceeding the RHNA  
10 numbers, nor the approximately 4,000 units proposed for  
11 consideration in the General Plan by the Town Council and  
12 Town Manager.

13           One thing I'd like to point out to the Commission and  
14 to the general public listening is that Los Gatos ranks  
15 worse in fire than Paradise did before it had its fire, and  
16 as someone who lives close to the hillside I think it's  
17 very important that we protect the hillside for the  
18 residents, for public safety, and also for the wildlife.

19           I think we have to take into consideration the North  
20 Forty and the results. As someone else mentioned, the North  
21 Forty was promised as affordable housing. It's anything but  
22 that. One thing with affordable housing, there is very  
23 little opportunity for people owning those houses to gain  
24 equity in them, they can only gain inflation, and so I  
25 think our town, with the leadership that we have and the

1 Town residents, can come up with other solutions to create  
2 more affordable options for housing, perhaps smaller units.

3 I would like to see the Historic Districts and the  
4 districts where homes were built in the early-1900s remain  
5 in that character. With legislation SB 9 and SB 10 that was  
6 passed, we've yet to see the impacts of that, and I think  
7 we should slow down on the General Plan. We're being too  
8 aggressive with the number of housing units that we're  
9 proposing and I think further study should be done before  
10 you make any drastic changes in that direction. Thank you  
11 for listening.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you so much for your comments.  
13 We definitely appreciate it, and I'd like to ask if any  
14 Commissioners have questions for Mr. Alarcon? I don't see  
15 any hands raised, so thank you again for your comments, and  
16 I would like to invite any other members of the public that  
17 would like to speak to us on the General Plan or the Final  
18 EIR for the General Plan to do so now.

19 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you. As the Chair mentioned, if  
20 anyone else would like to speak on the General Plan or  
21 Final EIR, please use the raised hand feature. The next  
22 speaker will be Joanne.

23 JOE RODGERS: This is Joe Rodgers. I'm going to speak  
24 for Joanne. Maybe she'll have some comments. Joanne and I  
25 have been residents to Los Gatos for 46 years, so we've

1 seen some changes in the community. One of the things that  
2 I want to do also is thank the members that are on this  
3 Commission for the time you devote. I don't think most of  
4 the people in the community realize the time that the group  
5 of you devotes to making certain that we maintain the  
6 integrity of our town. Congratulations, and thank you, and  
7 keep up the good work.

8       What I wanted to talk about was actually a request  
9 that is being considered by the Town Council for adding one  
10 to three cannabis dispensaries in the Town. Very much  
11 opposed to it. I think it certainly sends the wrong message  
12 about the quality and the nature of our Town, but my  
13 concerns also go to the traffic that three dispensaries, or  
14 one, would create, and problems with parking.

15       Another one is requirements for PG&E, for electrical  
16 power. Already we're trying to focus more on adding more  
17 electric cars, but also then water was mentioned. We've got  
18 things that we have to deal with in our current situation,  
19 but add the dispensaries...

20       Initially they're saying it would just be for the sale  
21 of cannabis, but that's the gorilla in the room, because  
22 the next step is we're just going to do a little packaging  
23 and processing, and then after we're going to add growing.

24       We already know that we suffer power outages from time  
25 to time, and with the requirements on power that are going

1 to be generated by these other activities, adding cannabis  
2 would be catastrophic, so I'm really requesting that this  
3 Commission and the Town Council do an environmental impact  
4 study, include this in your study, and make certain that we  
5 understand the environmental impact of adding cannabis  
6 sales, processing, and growing. It would have a very  
7 negative impact on the Town, including the image of the  
8 Town.

9 Right now the Town Council turned down the idea some  
10 years ago. What was it? 2016. Said that we would not permit  
11 it. Now they're considering it for generating revenue. I  
12 just wanted to touch base on that. I'd like to see a  
13 thorough environmental impact study, because they're  
14 considering doing this without having done very much  
15 homework on it. Thank you very much.

16 JOANNE RODGERS: The revenue, other towns have said  
17 for every dollar you take in for a cannabis sale you spend  
18 four, and the policing and the trafficking, the crime, etc.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for your comments. I think  
20 your three minutes are up, but I would also encourage you  
21 to send your comments in writing to Staff, because that  
22 would be the best way to make sure that they get attention  
23 by the appropriate people, because we are talking in terms  
24 of the General Plan and we don't address that at all in the  
25 General Plan, so please do send your comments into Staff.

1           JOE RODGERS:  When you say Staff, whom do you mean?  
2 Who do we direct written comments to?

3           CHAIR HANSSEN:  Staff, could you jump in and let them  
4 know how to send in comments to Staff?

5           JENNIFER ARMER:  You can send it in to me and I can  
6 forward it onto the appropriate Staff, or you can send it  
7 through the Town Manager's office, as they are managing the  
8 discussion and consideration of cannabis.

9           JOANNE RODGERS:  As relating to what you're talking  
10 about here, it's the EIR report that we're asking for to be  
11 included.

12           JENNIFER ARMER:  Comments recommending or asking for  
13 an environmental review in association with the cannabis  
14 discussion, I can take those comments and share them with  
15 the Town Manager's office as they continue forward with  
16 those discussions with the Town Council, so feel free to  
17 send those on into me and I can forward them to the correct  
18 Staff.

19           JOE RODGERS:  Okay, thank you very much.

20           CHAIR HANSSEN:  Are there others that would like to  
21 speak to us on the General Plan or the General Plan EIR?

22           JOEL PAULSON:  Yes, thank you, Chair. The next speaker  
23 is John.

24           JOHN:  Good evening. First of all, thank you all for  
25 all the hard work that you do. This is an incredibly

1 difficult process that you go through trying to do the  
2 strategic planning and engagement of the local community,  
3 so thank you very much for your time. Just a couple of real  
4 quick comments, it won't take three minutes.

5       First of all, when I look through the plan I'm  
6 generally supportive of additional housing units in the  
7 neighborhood of about 2,000. What popped out at me was the  
8 804 opportunities for land development and maybe 1,200 in  
9 the redevelopment section, so that rounds out to just a  
10 little bit over 2,000, which I think is the right number  
11 for a lot of reasons.

12       One reason, we all know trying to get into, out of, or  
13 around Los Gatos during the summer is very, very difficult,  
14 so if we were to increase population by going for the 3,900  
15 units, another approximate 9,000 residents in Los Gatos, I  
16 just don't see how that works well in terms of traffic.

17       Secondly, I think as we look at developing housing it  
18 would be great to try to do most of it in the conversion of  
19 commercial properties that exist along strong road  
20 corridors today to multi-use, so perhaps in the area of the  
21 old auto row in Los Gatos, some of those properties, which  
22 are on Los Gatos Boulevard, which has a lot of traffic  
23 capacity, would be smart.

24       My final comment is we reference wildfire in the  
25 report extensively, but I don't see a lot of strength in

1 the wildfire, fuels, mitigation, and management, and to the  
2 previous speaker who mentioned that we're in worse shape  
3 than Paradise was at the time of their fire, that is just  
4 an essential area for us to pay attention to. If we were to  
5 lose a major portion of the hillside to fire, not only  
6 wildlife, but the visual nature that makes Los Gatos so  
7 appealing, and all of the trails and outdoor use that is so  
8 appealing to so many of our residents. That sums up the  
9 high points for me, and thank you very much.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: We thank you very much for your  
11 comments, and I will ask if any Commissioners have  
12 questions for you. I don't see any hands raised, and so  
13 thank you for your comments. I see many people in the  
14 attendees. Is there anyone else that would like to speak to  
15 us on the General Plan or the General Plan Final EIR? At  
16 the point where I close the public hearing, even if you  
17 raise your hand, we won't be able to take your comments  
18 during the meeting, although you are always welcome to send  
19 in written comments. Would anyone else like to speak?

20 JOEL PAULSON: I don't see any additional hands up,  
21 Chair. Let's give it a few more seconds. I don't see any  
22 additional hands.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: I do know from the names of some of  
24 the people that are in the participants that many of you  
25 have already sent in written comments as well, and you can

1 be assured that we do have all of them, and all of us spent  
2 many hours over the last several days reading the hundreds  
3 of comments that we've had, I think it was about 600 pages,  
4 so I thank you all for sending them in.

5 With that in mind, we will close the public comments  
6 portion of the hearing on the General Plan and the General  
7 Plan Final EIR, and given that it is 9:20 we will continue  
8 the discussion, but I'm going to have the Planning  
9 Commission and Staff take a ten-minute recess, so we'll  
10 come back at 9:30.

11 (INTERMISSION)

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: ...in general Exhibit 7, along with  
13 Staff's general feedback, whether it's not recommended or  
14 neutral, meaning they don't have an opinion one way or the  
15 other, and then it would be up to us to consider it.

16 As far as Exhibit 7 goes, at the beginning of Exhibit  
17 7 there are some comments by entity, not by element, so  
18 there are comments from the Department of Forestry  
19 regarding wildfire. There are comments from Staff, and then  
20 comments from specifically the Parks and Public Works part  
21 of Staff, so we will discuss those as a group before we go  
22 dig into each element.

23 In addition to what I just said, I also want to talk  
24 about the order of the elements, because the bulk of the  
25 comments that we have received, and especially the negative

1 comments, are related to the numbers in the Land Use  
2 Element. We will discuss all of the other elements first,  
3 because they have substantially less comments and we should  
4 be able to get through them, and then we will turn our  
5 discussion to the Land Use and Community Design Elements  
6 near the end, and then finally we will proceed forward and  
7 discuss the EIR and whether or not we should recommend  
8 certification.

9       As mentioned earlier by Staff, and by myself as well,  
10 our role in this process is only to recommend. We are not  
11 the final deciding body as we are for other land use  
12 matters. We will be forwarding a recommendation to Town  
13 Council and they will be holding their own hearings.

14       That being said, I always think that the Planning  
15 Commission, and I know this from the Town Council, that  
16 they're counting on us to do a thorough review of the  
17 General Plan, and so that what they send to us in theory  
18 should be something they will agree with and it won't have  
19 to be a complete review of everything going past. So that  
20 being the case, if you haven't already pulled Exhibit 7, I  
21 would ask that you pull up Exhibit 7 so that we could go  
22 ahead and start the discussion.

23       The first thing in Exhibit 7 is the recommended  
24 changes to the Introduction, which includes the Vision and  
25 Guiding Principles. If you look on page 1 of Exhibit 7,

1 which is also on page 217 in your packet, it talks about  
2 the GPAC recommended changes to the Vision and Guiding  
3 Principles and it has summarized what some of the points of  
4 it are, but I'll just read it out.

5 Revised division for added clarity and add a sentence  
6 about racial, social, and environmental justice. Deleting  
7 downtown from the Community Vitality Guiding Principle.  
8 Adding a new Guiding Principle titled "Connectivity," which  
9 came from one of the GPAC members, to state the importance  
10 of connecting all facets of Town. And then deleting the  
11 Towns from the Fiscal Stability Responsibility Guiding  
12 Principles, and replace the word "recognized" with the word  
13 "value" in the Inclusivity Guiding Principle.

14 That was the comments that the GPAC recommended that  
15 we adopt, and the way that the process worked is we had  
16 considered the Vision and Guiding Principles and they were  
17 voted on by the GPAC, then the Planning Commission, and the  
18 Town Council, and since they were adopted that way we  
19 couldn't modify the draft plan to do that, so this is the  
20 time when the Commission would recommend or not recommend  
21 those changes that came from the GPAC, so I'll throw that  
22 up for discussion, and if there's anything else that you  
23 want to change in the Introduction as well, we can talk  
24 about that. Commissioner Janoff.

25

1           COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Thank you. I just wanted to  
2 clarify a little bit why these changes are in front of you.  
3 Essentially, we went through such a long period of time  
4 that life around us and the world around us changed. We had  
5 the pandemic occur, we had the racial voices through the  
6 world were speaking to us loudly, and so we felt compelled  
7 to go back and look at the Vision, which was crafted before  
8 all of these world events were taking place, and thought  
9 wow, in light of what we've all just lived through we felt  
10 that we needed to add some changes, and so it wasn't taken  
11 lightly that we were recommending changes over what Town  
12 Council had already approved, but we thought that in light  
13 of the two years that had gone by since the Vision  
14 Statement was initially crafted it made sense to reflect  
15 back and bring us up to the present. So, just to give you  
16 guys an idea of why we wanted to make those changes. They  
17 were well thought through.

18           CHAIR HANSSEN: I can add onto that that when we  
19 crafted the Vision Statement the GPAC spent a whole entire  
20 meeting, maybe more than one meeting, on every single word  
21 that was in the Vision Statement before we even sent it to  
22 the Planning Commission or Town Council, so it wasn't taken  
23 lightly to do all that, and the Guiding Principles actually  
24 stemmed from direction from Town Council on how to go about  
25 updating the General Plan, and so we took those pretty much

1 as is and then added on and did some modifications before  
2 we sent it on for approval.

3 It wasn't on this list, but there was one add that was  
4 late in there and that's currently in there. Ms. Pendleton  
5 has spoken previously to the GPAC on many occasions and had  
6 wanted to modify the Protect Natural Resources to make sure  
7 we address the biotic communities as well, so that has  
8 already been modified, and I don't see it listed here as a  
9 change we need to adapt, because it looked like it was  
10 already in the draft.

11 Does anyone have any concerns about any of the changes  
12 that were recommended? Commissioner Thomas has her hand up.

13 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I don't have any concerns, I  
14 just want to say that it's been a while since we looked at  
15 this, and I looked back and I still feel the same about all  
16 the changes that we recommended as members of the GPAC.

17 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Okay, cool. The way that I'm hoping  
18 this process will work—I'll say it now, because we have  
19 lots of elements to go through—is that even though we have  
20 to vote on the overall plan as a recommendation, Staff and  
21 I both thought it would be very helpful to make a motion to  
22 approve X element or section with changes as noted in the  
23 Staff Report, kind of like we do in a regular hearing. Even  
24 though at the very end we're going to have make a  
25 recommendation on the overall element, if we can kind of

1 come to an agreement on each section, it will make it a lot  
2 easier to do the thing at the very end. Vice Chair Barnett.

3 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I just wanted to offer my  
4 congratulations to the GPAC and to the Staff for the  
5 tremendous work they've done on this project. It's much  
6 appreciated, and I know there were many long hours and  
7 numerous meetings to get us to this point, so that's  
8 appreciated. I certainly support Paragraph 1, Recommended  
9 Changes to the Vision and Guiding Principles.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: Great. If there are no other comments  
11 on the Vision and Guiding Principles, would one of the  
12 Commissioners make a motion to approve the changes to the  
13 Vision and Guiding Principles as recommended in the Staff  
14 Report? Vice Chair Barnett.

15 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I certainly make that motion.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: And then Commissioner Tavana, you had  
17 your hand up, so would you make a second?

18 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I second that.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'm going to ask Staff, do we need to  
20 do a roll call vote for every single one of these? Can we  
21 just do all in favor? I think it would take a lot of time  
22 to do roll call vote for everyone of these, so I'm going to  
23 ask Staff what you think?

24 JOEL PAULSON: I'd probably defer to the Town  
25 Attorney. Obviously that being the safest, but if you want

1 to just do it by show of hands and I can reflect what the  
2 show of hands is, that might go a little faster.

3 ROBERT SCHULTZ: I would suggest that we do it by  
4 motion.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: We just did the motion, but do I need  
6 to do a full roll call vote, or can we just do by show of  
7 hands?

8 ROBERT SCHULTZ: No, we have to do a roll call. The  
9 Brown Act requires it, because we're not in person.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, then I will do that very  
11 quickly. Commissioner Thomas.

12 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

14 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Raspe.

16 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

18 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

21 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

22 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I vote yes as well. Ms. Armer, you  
24 had your hand up.

25

1           JENNIFER ARMER: Thank you, Chair. I thought I would  
2 put forward the suggestion—while this recommendation from  
3 the GPAC does kind of stand on its own—that moving forward  
4 often those motions can be a group of these items, and so  
5 you won't have to make 123 motions, but it really can be  
6 clustered. If there are several points that a Commissioner  
7 wants to make a motion that Items 2, 3, and 4 be approved,  
8 or something like that, we could do them as groups as well  
9 to reduce the votes.

10           CHAIR HANSSEN: That is actually my intent, when we  
11 get to the actual elements, starting with the Racial,  
12 Social, and Environmental Justice Element. There are 11  
13 suggestions and we don't need to vote on each one. For  
14 instance, I made my own notes and I said yes, no, yes, no,  
15 that kind of thing. We should only recommend the things  
16 that we'd like to see changed, and so we can do that as a  
17 group motion.

18           I didn't want to leave the Introduction, because there  
19 was a comment that came in a Desk Item from Commissioner  
20 Clark, and I believe it has been suggested by a few others,  
21 and it was about modify the section called "Los Gatos  
22 Community" to put more explanation of the origin of the  
23 Town lands coming from the Ohlone Indians. I don't know if  
24 I characterized that appropriately from your perspective,  
25 Commissioner Clark, but I personally wouldn't have a

1 problem with adding a little bit more definition to that  
2 section. Commissioner Thomas, you have a comment?

3 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I support that change.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Are there any other thoughts about  
5 that, and did I characterize that the way that you wanted  
6 it, Commissioner Clark?

7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me take one more look at it,  
8 and Commissioner Janoff can go while I look to make sure.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: No, I don't believe you had suggested  
10 the exact wording, it was more a general comment about  
11 adding a little more depth to that section to explain the  
12 lands had originally been Ohlone Indian land.

13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, I got that.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay. Commissioner Janoff.

15 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Two things. I'd also like to  
16 lend my support for that addition, but in regard to  
17 Commissioner Clark's comments, which came in late today and  
18 haven't had the benefit of Staff going through them and  
19 categorizing them the way they have all these other  
20 remarks, because there were so many comments I'm concerned  
21 about taking the time to go through each of Commissioner  
22 Clark's comments without the benefit of having Staff go  
23 through that process, and just am looking for guidance from  
24 the Chair on that.

25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yes, I did want to comment on that as  
2 well, although I called this one out in particular just  
3 because it was low hanging fruit. Commissioner Clark, we're  
4 very happy that you're sending your comments, and they were  
5 very thorough and detailed. I don't know that they will get  
6 the attention from all of the Commission that they deserve  
7 for what we're going through right now, so my suggestion  
8 about how to handle the balance of your comments would be  
9 to ask Staff to take a look at them and make the same  
10 determination about this is an easy one to fix as  
11 recommended, or this required discussion, and then since I  
12 don't think that we'll finish the entire review tonight  
13 that we would have an opportunity to consider the rest of  
14 your comments when we have a follow up meeting. Ms. Armer.

15 JENNIFER ARMER: Thank you, Chair. I would say that  
16 with any suggestions, whether Staff has given a  
17 recommendation or not on it, it would be included as part  
18 of your recommendation to Town Council; that's one of the  
19 benefits of you making a recommendation rather than making  
20 a final decision. If there is wording that's suggested by  
21 one of the Commissioners, whether it's already provided in  
22 writing or it's part of the discussion this evening, that  
23 could be part of your recommendation, and then Staff can  
24 provide feedback on that when we take that forward to Town  
25 Council if there are any concerns.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yes, I understand that. What I'm  
2 saying, if I didn't make it clear, is I don't know that the  
3 Commissioners, myself included, have had the time to really  
4 process the comments from Commissioner Clark because of all  
5 the other comments that we were processing that came in in  
6 the addendum and the Desk Item as well as in the Staff  
7 (inaudible), so I'd like to make sure that we gave it the  
8 attention before we made a determination, and even though I  
9 have a lot of faith in Commissioner Clark, I am  
10 uncomfortable with unilaterally saying just because you  
11 submitted this, even though I haven't had a chance to  
12 really go through it, that I would recommend all your  
13 changes is what I'm saying. Commissioner Clark.

14 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. Yeah, I completely  
15 agree, and when I wasn't able to get them in by Monday I  
16 kind of knew that it's not at all expected of you all to  
17 have taken a thorough look at them or anything, and so I  
18 think I'm happy during the discussion to highlight any that  
19 I'm more passionate about or that are more significant and  
20 require discussion, and I think that they could even be  
21 sent to Council separate from the Planning Commission, or  
22 that since we will probably be continuing our discussion we  
23 might be able to get some Staff input before then.

24 CHAIR HANSSEN: That sounds like a good plan. That  
25 being the case, I did want to put that one item out there,

1 because I definitely have also heard it from a Council  
2 Member as well, and so I'd like somebody to make a motion  
3 to add some of the language about the Ohlone Indians to the  
4 Los Gatos Community section of the Introduction.  
5 Commissioner Clark.

6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. I move to add some  
7 language going more in depth on the origin of the lands of  
8 Los Gatos, particularly in relation to the Ohlone and the  
9 Tamien tribes in the Los Gatos Community Vision section.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, that sounds great, and  
11 Commissioner Thomas, is that a second?

12 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes, I second the motion.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'll just go ahead and take the roll  
14 call vote. Commissioner Thomas.

15 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

17 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Raspe.

19 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

21 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

22 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

24 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

25 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I vote yes as well, so I think  
2 we're covered for the Introduction. Did anyone else have  
3 anything substantive that they wanted to change in the  
4 Introduction?

5 Then we can move on to the other comments that are in  
6 the front of Exhibit 7. If you look under Item 2 on page  
7 217, it's revisions as a result of review by the State  
8 Department of Forestry, and Staff says included in Exhibit  
9 8 and listed here there are quite a number of bullet  
10 points, recommendations to change. In talking with Staff  
11 the recommendation was that we do have to make these  
12 changes, because we have to have the State Department of  
13 Forestry and Cal Fire review our General Plan, and so we  
14 pretty much need to accept all those. Director Paulson, you  
15 had your hand up. Did you want to say anything more about  
16 that? Okay, no. Commissioner Janoff.

17 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I'd like to just say that  
18 sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, taking us to a modification  
19 suggested in the public comments, these are comments that  
20 are coming from experts in their field. They may be  
21 mandated, they may be otherwise informed, but to me these  
22 are people who we should be taking guidance from, and so I  
23 would be prepared to move that we accept those comments,  
24 which go through the top of page 4, as recommended by  
25 Staff.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think that's an even better  
2 suggestion, because I have the same feeling that I wouldn't  
3 want to part ways and opinion on this, especially our  
4 Staff's recommendation but also from the outside experts,  
5 so I agree that we should do that, and so I'll second the  
6 motion actually. Are there any comments?

7 I only wanted to say one thing though, just because  
8 we're not going to go over these in detail, that on Item 3  
9 as suggested by Staff, which was referenced in the Staff  
10 Report, is to add an implementation program for a five-year  
11 Land Use Element review. We aren't going to discuss the  
12 Land Use Element until the end of the process, but given  
13 the amount of concern in the community about the build-out  
14 numbers, I think it's really prudent to have a five-year  
15 land use review because of the uncertainty that we have  
16 about what's going to happen going forward. It's already in  
17 the motion and seconded to accept all of that, but I wanted  
18 to make sure that you guys had seen that so that when we do  
19 get to land use you'll know that we have, assuming that  
20 everyone votes for recommending it and it goes through  
21 Council, that we'll have some way to help manage the risk.  
22 So, I will go to Commissioner Thomas.

23 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

24 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

25 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Raspe.

2 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

3 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

4 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

8 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: And then I vote yes as well. We're  
10 going to go to page 220, the modifications suggested in  
11 public comments, and I had missed this, but I mentioned it  
12 earlier. In the Introduction there was the protect the  
13 natural resources Guiding Principle to adopt the concept of  
14 biotic communities waterways. So, Staff, do we need to vote  
15 on that in addition to what we did? I thought that was  
16 already in there.

17 JENNIFER ARMER: I believe that is an additional  
18 change to what was drafted by the GPAC to have that done  
19 and track changes, but you actually in previous pages have..

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: I was looking for it when we went over  
21 Item 1, and so that's why I thought it was already adopted,  
22 but then when I went to page 220 it's listed as a separate  
23 item from what the GPAC recommended, and so that's why I  
24 was confused, because I thought the GPAC recommended to do  
25 that change to the Introduction as well.

1           JENNIFER ARMER: As I'm reading through side-by-side  
2 what is in the GPAC recommendation and what is listed here,  
3 it does appear to be the same language, so it looks like we  
4 just pulled that out of a separate comment, not recognizing  
5 that it was already in the GPAC recommendations, so no, you  
6 do not need to make any further motion.

7           CHAIR HANSSEN: All right, so then we should go on to  
8 the Racial, Social, and Environmental Justice Element.  
9 Commissioner Janoff talked a little bit about it, but for  
10 those of you that are relatively new to the process, the  
11 origin of the Racial, Social, and Environmental Justice  
12 Element was recognition during the pandemic.

13           As we were meeting in 2020 we had the pandemic, and  
14 then we had all the protests from Black Lives Matter, and  
15 then Vice Chair Janoff and I said, and we brought up to the  
16 GPAC and Staff, that we had concern that we were not really  
17 addressing the full array of issues that were happening in  
18 the Town in planning for the General Plan, so we held a  
19 special meeting in July 2020 where we invited members of  
20 the public to speak to us on issues that they might have  
21 encountered related to racial and social injustice, or  
22 environmental justice for that matter, and we did have  
23 quite a number of people testify.

24           At the same time the Town Council was also doing  
25 things. They were interviewing and doing workshops, but

1 everyone on the GPAC felt that it was important to address  
2 the racial, social, and environmental justice in the  
3 General Plan at least at a high General Plan level, and  
4 when we did that we recognized that there would be people  
5 that thought it didn't go far enough, which we've gotten  
6 testimony to from the public, and that we could always do  
7 more, and there are comments in here relating to doing  
8 more, but everyone on the GPAC felt it was important to do  
9 it as an element. Even though our consultants said you  
10 could also do this as incorporating that into other  
11 sections and address it throughout the plan, we felt it was  
12 more important to call it out as a separate item.

13         So there is on Item 9 in here the possibility of  
14 deleting the entire section or moving the Racial, Social,  
15 and Environmental Justice Element to a later section in the  
16 document. The GPAC did vote to keep it up front in the  
17 document, and obviously since we recommended doing it we  
18 wouldn't recommend deleting it. I just wanted to give you  
19 guys the background on that element in case you hadn't  
20 heard that when you read it, but that's where it came from.  
21 In general we've gotten very good feedback from everyone in  
22 the public that this is the right direction to go.

23         That being the case, there are also 10 through 19 that  
24 are suggestions, and what we need to get to is whether or  
25 not we want to recommend any of those specific changes as

1 part of the recommendation to Town Council. Commissioner  
2 Thomas.

3 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I just have a clarifying  
4 question. For the rest of these, now that experts, etc. are  
5 not necessarily suggesting these, and we are kind of going  
6 to be going through them number-by-number, do we just want  
7 to discuss the ones that we would like to adopt to  
8 recommend, and just not even mention the ones that we don't  
9 support essentially?

10 CHAIR HANSEN: I'll tell you the direction Staff  
11 gave. They said if we try to discuss every single one of  
12 them it's going to take a really, really long time, and so  
13 maybe the thing to do would be to call out ones that we  
14 thought... I could go through each one of these and tell you  
15 that no, I didn't want to include this because it was  
16 confusing and I don't think that the Town has control over  
17 it, so maybe the better thing would be to focus on the ones  
18 that we thought we could add and tee those up for  
19 discussion.

20 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay, I just wanted to confirm,  
21 because I went through all of them and it's like some I  
22 felt strongly one way or another and then some, just like  
23 the Town said, I'm neutral on, so okay.

24 CHAIR HANSEN: Why don't you start and say which ones  
25 you think were worth including?

1           COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I think that number 11 is worth  
2 including, that additional language. I think that number  
3 13, I like the use of the word "increase" instead of  
4 promote. And I like 15, the "implement and require," I like  
5 that language change. Number 18, I also support. For  
6 numbers 17 and number 19, I had some kind of questions  
7 around those. For number 17, I recommended maybe the  
8 language should be changed to "marginalized" or  
9 "historically marginalized groups" or "minority groups" to  
10 be more specific. Then number 19, I don't think the end of  
11 that is appropriate, but I do like part of that one and I  
12 feel like it needs some discussion.

13           CHAIR HANSSEN: People have their hands up, but on  
14 number 19 I'll just weigh in right away and say I wrote a  
15 comment about the last sentence. I don't know that we need  
16 to go into a lot of detail about what kind of trees in the  
17 Racial, Social, and Environmental Justice Element when we  
18 have other elements that pertain to the environment and  
19 what kind of trees that we should be putting in there, so I  
20 thought that was too specific.

21           COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I liked the part about the  
22 habitat valuation and tree selection for the Town's  
23 planting, but then not including the disallowing of  
24 planting of invasive species. Well, invasive species I  
25 guess is fine, but yeah.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Well, let's see what other  
2 Commissioners have to say. Commissioner Janoff, I think you  
3 were first, and then Commissioner Clark.

4 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I generally agree with the  
5 recommendations from Commissioner Thomas, except that on 14  
6 and 15, rather than make those policies I think they have  
7 better language to be implementation programs, so I'd  
8 recommend that we act on that but we move them into the  
9 IPs. Seventeen, I wouldn't agree with, because I think that  
10 the changes over time, unless there is some very, very  
11 broad wording that would make sense.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: On 15, I have a question. On 14, I had  
13 a question for you. If you read the thing it talks about  
14 working with colleges, and both private and public colleges  
15 and schools and trade schools. I didn't see the sense in  
16 calling out a specific college being San Jose State, nor  
17 did I think that it belonged in the implementation  
18 programs, only because it was already a policy. I just  
19 think it was fine as it was. I don't know what the reason  
20 was for mentioning San Jose State.

21 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: If this person is really keen on  
22 developing a relationship that is a recruiting mechanism  
23 for San Jose State, maybe there is some link there, because  
24 it's a major university in our community, so I didn't have  
25

1 an issue with it, but I didn't think we needed to go into  
2 the detail here.

3 CHAIR HANSSEN: As it stands now, it's a policy that  
4 talks about working with different universities. Are you  
5 saying to remove it then and move the entire policy to the  
6 implementation program, or just working with San Jose  
7 State?

8 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: If we're going to mention San  
9 Jose State specifically, we should put it in an  
10 implementation program. If we leave it at university level,  
11 which is consistent with broad topics for the General Plan,  
12 then that's where I would go.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: All right, fair enough. Then 15 is  
14 already a policy. It's a question of whether it says,  
15 "develop and implement" or "implement and require." It's  
16 already a policy. Are you saying that we should move it to  
17 an implementation program?

18 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: On 15, I think that if you're  
19 going to require, if you're going to go beyond developing,  
20 then there's some more action that needs to be done around  
21 that. That felt more like it needed a little bit more of a  
22 plan-around if we're going to go for it, otherwise I'd say  
23 don't go that direction.

24 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, fair enough. I wrote down that  
25 since we're developing and implementing it for all time and

1 place I didn't think it was necessary to add (inaudible),  
2 but I don't care that much about it. Let's see,  
3 Commissioner Clark had some comments.

4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think Commissioner Thomas had  
5 one on the one that was just mentioned, if you want to say  
6 that right now.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yeah, let me go back to Commissioner  
8 Thomas then.

9 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I was looking at the  
10 implementation programs, because there is Implementation  
11 Program C that says it is requiring all Staff to undergo  
12 ongoing diversity and implicit bias training, but then it  
13 says that it's supporting 2.6, which is... I'm just trying to  
14 look back and forth. They were promoting hiring procedures.  
15 I feel like 2.7 needs to be added to the list for  
16 Implementation Program C. It might have been one of those  
17 like we added a thing and it got bumped and it never got  
18 cross-checked again.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: I see what you're saying. Because  
20 Implementation Program C is about Town Staff, diversity,  
21 and other training, and so to not link it to 2.7 seems like  
22 an oversight.

23 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yeah, C should be 2.6, 2.7, and  
24 1.3.

25

1 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Yes, I agree. I think what I'm saying  
2 is that I agree with what Commissioner Janoff said, but I  
3 also think that it already is an implementation program, so  
4 I think that changing the language is okay, because we're  
5 already going to be doing an implementation program  
6 associated with it.

7 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Okay, fair enough. I don't see a whole  
8 lot of difference between "develop" and "implement," or  
9 "implement" and "require" as long as we have an  
10 implementation program that supports it. Commissioner  
11 Clark.

12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. I completely agree on  
13 that. Another comment that I have for number 15 is that I  
14 think that something else that often happens with these  
15 diversity trainings is they become very passive and  
16 something that people just click through in order to meet  
17 the requirement, and that's something that I'd like to make  
18 sure doesn't happen with the Town. I don't know if this  
19 goes far enough to really make sure that happens, but I  
20 thought adding a description saying like, "Require an  
21 engaging, substantive, and interactive cultural proficiency  
22 training," or something like that could help make that  
23 clearer, and that's in the language that I provided if you  
24 want to look at that; it's number 3 under A, Wording  
25 Changes. But for the other ones, I agree with the others

1 that Commissioners have been in favor of. Another that I  
2 was curious about what others think is number 12, because I  
3 wasn't really sure, and I didn't have a problem with it,  
4 but I wanted to know what others think.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Staff did not recommend it. Maybe  
6 Staff could comment on why they didn't recommend 12. I  
7 think I know, but I want to hear it from Staff.

8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And I didn't catch that, so thank  
9 you.

10 JENNIFER ARMER: Thank you, Chair. The reason that we  
11 did mark that one as not recommended, and I think related  
12 to some of the discussion you've been having here as well,  
13 is I'll remind the Commission that this is a high-level  
14 document, and so when these do start to get that specific  
15 where it's talking about a specific score, that's not the  
16 type of thing that would be appropriate to track a policy  
17 in the General Plan. Recognizing that having quantifiable  
18 ways of measuring some of these things is definitely  
19 important, but specifying exactly how that's going to be  
20 done through one of the policies in the General Plan is not  
21 something that Staff would recommend. That's how some of  
22 these policies could be implemented through programs  
23 through the Town as the Town Council prioritizes those  
24 types of programs and development, including details of  
25 Staff training and such that you were mentioning, which are

1 very important, but really are part of the development of  
2 what those trainings should be. Some of those details can  
3 be included at this level, but for this particular one we  
4 chose to not recommend approval, because of how specific it  
5 was getting.

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: I will also go as far as to say that  
7 Implementation Program E, Social and Racial Justice  
8 Equality Survey, which is an annual survey on the  
9 successfulness of advancing social equity and diversity, I  
10 don't think we need to have policy specifying that we need  
11 to do that, since we already have it as in implementation  
12 program. I don't know if anyone else sees it that way, but  
13 to me that is very much of an action step, assuming that  
14 gets added to the list of things that Staff is going to  
15 work on.

16 I had a question about the one about a quality living  
17 wage, it's 13, and my question for Staff is it says it  
18 promotes in the current policy the draft, and then someone  
19 suggested to change it to "increase or improve," which is  
20 definitely more specific, but my question is the Town  
21 doesn't actually have control over a quality living wage  
22 for all community members. That is in the hands of the  
23 employers, of which the Town could be one of them, but I'm  
24 not sure from Staff's perspective if that's something that  
25 we could really commit to and stand behind.

1 JENNIFER ARMER: I'll start, and the Community  
2 Development Director may have something to add as well.

3 I agree that while that change in language we did mark  
4 as neutral, it is true that there is only so much that we'd  
5 be able to do in terms of actually increasing. It really  
6 would be more in the character of trying to have programs  
7 that promote it and support the increase in the ways that  
8 we have. It looks like we also have Town Manager Prevetti  
9 with us this evening, and she may have something to add to  
10 this question as well.

11 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Yes, of course, Town Manager.

12 LAUREL PREVETTI: Thank you so much. In the past the  
13 Council has been asked to consider increasing minimum wage  
14 above what the state requires, and through its strategic  
15 priorities the Town Council has decided not to go in that  
16 direction. We typically just follow what the state is  
17 doing, but promoting these opportunities is something that  
18 is more in line with what smaller jurisdictions are able to  
19 do. The larger cities tend to be really the big leaders on  
20 this, and we typically don't have the resources to actually  
21 implement our own living wage ordinances. That would have  
22 to be implemented by other businesses.

23 CHAIR HANSSSEN: That's really helpful. Thank you for  
24 that. For me, I would say not change 13, just leave it  
25 where it is and (inaudible) promote. That's my feeling on

1 it. Commissioners Thomas and Janoff, you still have your  
2 hands up, so I don't know which one was first.

3 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: My comment is only that I think  
4 I misspoke when I said I supported number 13. I have  
5 written in my notes that I do not. We don't really have  
6 enough control over this, so I would say no to 13.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: All right. Commissioner Thomas.

8 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I agree after hearing about  
9 local jurisdiction, so I don't support that change. But  
10 going back to number 17, perhaps the language could be  
11 changed to "socially disadvantaged and historically  
12 marginalized groups." I think "historically marginalized"  
13 is a large enough term that can be used that is dynamic and  
14 will change over the next 20 years, and so I think that  
15 that is more specific, but also still broad enough.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

17 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes, thank you. I just want to  
18 make sure that we link from the policy in number 12 to the  
19 implementation programs that you mentioned, Chair Hanssen,  
20 to Implementation Program E. I think that's what we were  
21 referencing, so if we're going to use that as a metric, it  
22 should be listed probably under that section there.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: That's not a bad idea. Would that not  
24 be true about every policy though? That's the only thing.

25

1 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I'm not one way or another, but  
2 I did notice that it does (inaudible) so if you want to use  
3 that as a way to make sure it is accounted for in the  
4 future. Then, also in number 14 I wouldn't support adding  
5 San Jose State University and leaving the language as is.  
6 Everything else I'm rather neutral on.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: That makes sense. I'm just going to go  
8 back to that thing you brought up, and I didn't want to  
9 belabor it, but it's in a list of policies under RSEJ-1,  
10 which is, "Support equity inclusion and access to  
11 opportunities for all community members, employees,  
12 businesses, and visitors." There's service delivery,  
13 community budgeting, institutional bias, housing  
14 affordability, Town diversity, welcoming town, and quality  
15 of living wage, so I think where I was going with it is  
16 that if we're going to have a survey, it would be covering  
17 a lot of these issues, not just whether we're a welcoming  
18 town or not. If we're going to do a survey, we should be  
19 addressing more than that issue.

20 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: That makes sense.

21 CHAIR HANSSEN: Then under one of these things that  
22 we're trying to promote, to say we're only going to survey  
23 on that one didn't make any sense to me. Does that make  
24 sense?

25 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: No, it does. It does.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: I just think we don't need to do  
2 number 12 at all, unless we want to put somewhere else in  
3 the policies as a general thing, make sure we have an  
4 implementation program, but we already do, so I think we  
5 would be covered by the fact that we already have that.

6 Are there any other ones we need to discuss?  
7 Commissioner Thomas, since you started this discussion,  
8 let's maybe go back and recap the ones that we're still  
9 thinking that we should recommend for changes and see if we  
10 can get to a conclusion.

11 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Do you want me to do this in a  
12 motion?

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yeah, why don't you do a motion?

14 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Commissioner Clark has her hand  
15 raised, so I think she maybe wants to add something before  
16 I summarize.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yes, go ahead, Commissioner Clark.

18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. I just have a quick  
19 question. Before we did this, if I had a couple of changes  
20 that I would like to see that are not in these public  
21 comment summaries, would I want to make sure that this is  
22 included, or would we want to do that separately?

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: The issue that I had when I started  
24 with this is that you could tell us about it, but I'm not  
25 sure if everyone would have given it the thought that we

1 need to be able to process it, that's all. But we can try  
2 that if you had specific language that you wanted to put  
3 in. We can try and see if that resonates with the  
4 Commission.

5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Could I do that right now?

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yeah, why don't you go ahead?

7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, thank you. There are two  
8 things.

9 One is I think, like Commissioner Janoff said, we've  
10 learned a lot since this was created and then also past  
11 that amount of time, especially about equity and equality,  
12 and I didn't think that the definitions of equality and  
13 equity in the key terms accurately described these  
14 concepts. I talked to some diversity experts who I get to  
15 work with too and came up with some alternative  
16 definitions. For equality, instead of saying, "The state of  
17 being equal, especially in status, rights, and  
18 opportunities," it would say, "Equal opportunity levels of  
19 support and allocation of resources regardless of different  
20 circumstances." For equity, instead of stating, "Fairness  
21 or justice in the way people are treated," it would state,  
22 "Differing allocation of opportunities, levels of support,  
23 and resources based on each person or group's circumstances  
24 or needs, thereby reaching an equal outcome." And if that  
25 makes sense to people, then maybe we could do it now, but

1 if not, I completely understand if people need to stay with  
2 that for longer.

3 CHAIR HANSSEN: I can speak for myself. I reviewed the  
4 definitions and what you suggested I thought was reasonable  
5 and was in line with... I don't know how many of you were  
6 able to attend the community meeting on March 31<sup>st</sup> on Zoom  
7 that was related to the Housing Element. They had a woman  
8 come and speak and she did a slide on equity versus  
9 equality and what the difference was, and it was a cartoon  
10 graphic that I thought was pretty clear to explain the  
11 differences and she talked about that, and so I thought  
12 your explanation was right in line with that, but I don't  
13 know if others had a chance to read through it. I will go  
14 to Commissioner Janoff.

15 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I had a chance to read through  
16 Commissioner Clark's comments fully, and I do support the  
17 change to these definitions.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay. Commissioner Thomas.

19 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I also support, so I can include  
20 that in my motion. Was there anything else that  
21 Commissioner Clark wanted to say in addition?

22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, yes. I have one other,  
23 and it's an implementation program that I think we should  
24 add. If you go to the policy RSEJ-4.1, it's a policy for  
25 acceptance of government-issued vouchers. I've worked very

1 closely with the unhoused community and with people who are  
2 on these vouchers and one of the biggest challenges that  
3 people encounter is not being able to use them, and so I  
4 was really, really happy to see this policy and excited  
5 about, but it is such an action-oriented one that I felt  
6 like it needed an implementation program to actually  
7 happen. I think it's one that would have a really big  
8 impact, and so I think it should be added as an  
9 implementation program for RSEJ after Program K, which is  
10 Community Engagement, and I think that the program should  
11 be implemented between 2020-2025, and I think it should  
12 also include the EJ icon for the cross-cutting icons under  
13 it.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think that's reasonable. I'm just  
15 going to ask Staff about it. We had a long discussion at  
16 the GPAC about the huge volume of implementation programs  
17 that we have and whether or not they would ever really  
18 happen, so I'm just going to ask Staff. I don't have any  
19 problem adding it in, and then ultimately the way this will  
20 work is the Town Council is the one that will prioritize  
21 what gets worked on in what year because of their strategic  
22 priorities session, and so it comes from the General Plan  
23 and other sources what gets onto the plate. So I don't have  
24 a problem with adding it, but I just want to make sure with  
25 Staff it is that something reasonable that we can add?

1           JENNIFER ARMER: Thank you, Chair. I think you're on  
2 point in terms of being cautious about adding additional  
3 implementation measures, because really to make those  
4 happen it will have to be prioritized by Town Council at  
5 their annual priority setting. I will also share the  
6 microphone with Town Manager Prevetti, because she has  
7 turned on her camera again.

8           LAUREL PREVETTI: Thank you. I just wanted to note  
9 that voucher programs are already in effect, Section 8, and  
10 obviously there's not enough vouchers to meet the need, and  
11 so I don't know if the Town can actually effect this very  
12 important program, because it's ultimately up to the  
13 individual landlords whether or not they accept it. We  
14 could certainly add it and then do some more Staff  
15 analysis. I think our Council might be a little bit  
16 cautious about adding things that we really can't impact,  
17 so it's going to take a little bit more work, and I don't  
18 know if our housing consultant would be able to really help  
19 do anything more than what's already being done. But we're  
20 happy to add it if that's the will of the Planning  
21 Commission, and then we can do some more research so by the  
22 time we get to Council we can answer their questions. Thank  
23 you.

24           CHAIR HANSSEN: Go ahead, Commissioner Clark.

25

1           COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. Can I make a  
2 clarification for it? I should have further described this  
3 policy so you can immediately flip to it, but it's  
4 government-issued food vouchers, and so this would be  
5 things like accepting electronic benefits transfer or EBT  
6 and SNAP vouchers at farmers market and local food vendors.  
7 I'd be curious to hear if that changes the answer or if you  
8 have any more comments.

9           LAUREL PREVETTI: I think our farmers market already  
10 accepts the cards, but that's something we can certainly  
11 look at, because I think that is consistent with our  
12 current practice of really supporting those who are trying  
13 to feed people in need, so we'll look at that a little bit  
14 more. Thank you for the clarification.

15           CHAIR HANSSEN: Other comments? Commissioner Thomas,  
16 are we going back to making a motion?

17           COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes. I would also like to add  
18 that I do think that making an implementation program for  
19 this does make sense, specifically because the Town  
20 provides business licenses, and so I don't know if that  
21 could be like changed within an ordinance that new vendors  
22 have to... I don't know if that's legal or something, but  
23 looking into the fact that new vendors can be required to  
24 accept certain forms of SNAP or EBT or whatever.

25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: I would suggest that if we're going to  
2 add it as an implementation we word it as like a research-  
3 oriented program. Not like a commitment to do it, but  
4 rather we research the viability of what we can do to  
5 increase support for acceptance of these vouchers.

6 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Exactly, exactly. Thank you. So,  
7 I will start with that. I move to approve or forward the  
8 following modifications suggested for the Racial, Social,  
9 and Environmental Justice Element: to add an implementation  
10 program for RSEJ-4.1 to do some research on coordinating  
11 and promoting the acceptance of government-issued food  
12 vouchers. I also move to make the changes to the  
13 definitions that Commissioner Clark submitted earlier for  
14 the key terms of "equality" and "equity." I also move to  
15 approve Policy Change 17 with the addition of adding  
16 "historically marginalized" as language to Policy RSEJ-6.2,  
17 and then also approve numbers 11, 15, and 18. I believe  
18 that summarized everything.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Did you want to do anything more on  
20 19?

21 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I don't think so, because it's  
22 an implementation program, unless someone feels really  
23 strongly.

24 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay. I didn't. I thought it was fine  
25 the way it was, and like I said, I don't necessarily think

1 we need to go there in terms of lots of detail about what  
2 kind of trees when we're in the Racial, Social, and  
3 Environmental Justice Element as long as we have policies  
4 about what kind of trees we put in Town. Commissioner  
5 Janoff.

6 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I'll second that motion.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: Any other comments before we vote?  
8 What we will be voting on after we finish taking comments  
9 would be recommending approval of the Racial, Social, and  
10 Environmental Justice Element with the changes incorporated  
11 and suggested by Commissioner Thomas. Vice Chair Barnett.

12 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I support the motion except for  
13 the wording of the key terms of "equality" and "equity,"  
14 and on those topics I haven't had an opportunity to see how  
15 those terms are used throughout the General Plan, and I'm  
16 reluctant to approve those changes without having done so.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, fair enough. That's a valid  
18 comment. Staff, when we were talking about this earlier  
19 today in terms of process and procedure, if there's a  
20 Commissioner that has an issue like that should they vote  
21 no or vote yes, not feeling comfortable with that comment,  
22 or maybe abstaining? What would be your suggestion on how  
23 to handle it?

24 JOEL PAULSON: I'm happy to start, and if Ms. Armer  
25 has anything to add, that's fine as well. I think probably

1 for this type of motion that Vice Chair Barnett could vote  
2 yes, but note the objection to the definitions at this  
3 point, and that way we could move forward. There will be  
4 verbatim minutes of all of these meetings provided as well,  
5 and then ultimately if this moves to the next meeting, if  
6 there are some additional comments after his review of  
7 those terms throughout the General Plan, if he had  
8 different thoughts he can always provide those in writing  
9 and those would be part of the public record.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: That sounds like a plan. Does that  
11 sound agreeable to you, Vice Chair?

12 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes, that's acceptable. I'd make  
13 a point that I request my comments be considered by the  
14 Council.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, that's fine. Do we have a  
16 second?

17 JOEL PAULSON: Commissioner Janoff already seconded  
18 the motion.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Oh, yeah. Sorry, I got distracted on  
20 the second. So, we have a motion and a second, and then  
21 I'll keep going in the same order. I'll start with  
22 Commissioner Thomas.

23 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

24 CHAIR HANSSEN: And then Commissioner Tavana.

25 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: And then Commissioner Raspe.

2 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

3 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

4 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

8 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes, with a recommendation that  
9 the Council consider the terms "equality" and "equity"  
10 after further review by members of the Commission, and that  
11 I will be happy to supply further comment by written  
12 response after my review.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: That sounds great. And then I vote yes  
14 as well. I did have a chance to review the definitions, so  
15 I'm okay with that whole thing. So, we've gotten through  
16 the Racial, Social, and Environmental Justice Element.

17 The next element in order of the plan is actually the  
18 Land Use Element, so we're going to skip that, and we're  
19 going to skip the Community Design Element as well, because  
20 Land Use and Community Design go hand-in-hand. The next  
21 element will be the Mobility Element.

22 Just for background on the Mobility Element, Staff,  
23 correct me if I'm wrong, I think the Mobility Element was  
24 one of the ones we might have reviewed five times.

25

1           JENNIFER ARMER: That was definitely one that had  
2 multiple reviews and total reorganization as well to really  
3 show the new priorities that the GPAC felt were important,  
4 and emphasizing certain topics and their importance by  
5 bringing them up to the front.

6           CHAIR HANSSEN: Then we also had quite a number of  
7 comments from Parks and Public Works pertaining to mobility  
8 in particular, because that's right in their wheelhouse  
9 that we already agreed to take on.

10           There are about 10-15 comments on the Mobility  
11 Element, and Staff did say: the first one was recommended;  
12 the second one, outside of the purview of the Los Gatos  
13 General Plan; the third one, not recommended; and the  
14 fourth one, not recommended. We could go through the same  
15 process, which is maybe if one of you felt comfortable  
16 enough about saying what you would recommend and  
17 incorporating those changes we could go from there and then  
18 not have to talk about the other ones. Commissioner Janoff.

19           COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I was going to piggyback on that  
20 comment by saying there was no recommended change to the  
21 General Plan with the exception of three items in my  
22 reading, 62 and 63. We don't want to get this level of  
23 detail in a goal or a policy, but if it seemed reasonable  
24 to study VTA, I'm not sure what queue jumping is, but if  
25 these are fine points that need to be studied in order to

1 improve VTA transportation, then I would recommend that  
2 they be added to or become an implementation program. I  
3 don't feel strongly about them one way or the other, but  
4 those look like they could take some action.

5 Then the only other one that is recommended is number  
6 67, which is to add a definition of traffic impact policy  
7 to the glossary, so my recommendation would be maybe two  
8 implementation programs, or one for 62 and 63, and yes to  
9 number 67.

10 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Just to comment on 62 and 63, if you  
11 read the comments from the EIR, VTA wrote a pretty  
12 extensive thing when it was related to traffic. Obviously,  
13 their priority is making sure that the buses get through,  
14 and so they had a number of suggestions on how we could  
15 prioritize bus traffic, so I would completely agree with  
16 you. I actually wrote in my comments that 62 and 63 could  
17 be implementation programs, because it's not even clear  
18 that they're feasible for the Town, and so we would have to  
19 study them to see if that was possible, and so I agree with  
20 you on that.

21 In addition to the not recommended ones, 64 and 65  
22 were clearly designated by Staff as being part of the  
23 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, not in the General  
24 Plan. So while we could certainly do these things, it may  
25

1 or may not make sense to change the draft of the Mobility  
2 Element.

3 Let's see, I also have Commissioner Thomas and  
4 Commissioner Clark that have comments, so go ahead,  
5 Commissioner Thomas.

6 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you. I agree with the  
7 comments so far about 62 and 63 being added as one  
8 implementation program. I looked over the implementation  
9 programs, but I'm happy to know if Staff thinks that those  
10 are already covered somewhere, but I don't believe that  
11 they are, so I'm happy to add that. Then the second thing  
12 was I also support number 67.

13 I did have question for Staff about when the Bicycle  
14 and Pedestrian Master Plan would be updated, because that  
15 was recommended for 64 and 65.

16 JENNIFER ARMER: I believe the Bicycle and Pedestrian  
17 Master Plan was just updated in the last few years, but we  
18 do have WooJae Kim from Parks and Public Works here and he  
19 may be able to give you a specific date.

20 WOOJAE KIM: Good evening, Commissioners. WooJae Kim,  
21 Town Engineer. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan was  
22 updated in 2020, so we would have to further investigate  
23 when the next round of updates would need to be, and we  
24 could definitely work with our Complete Streets and  
25 Transportation Commission and the Town Manager's Office and

1 CBD to figure when the next update needs to be, but I  
2 suspect it won't be for another two or three years, so I  
3 hope that answers your question.

4 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes, that does. Thank you.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Just to the question you're asking,  
6 Commissioner Thomas, I would say that since you sat on the  
7 GPAC with us, although I think it's really important that  
8 those particular corridors for Complete Streets are some of  
9 the most important ones and they would be talked about in  
10 the Community Design Elements in terms of they're like the  
11 main street in a couple of our Community Place Districts, I  
12 think it would be too much detail to put in the General  
13 Plan to call out specific streets for Complete Streets, and  
14 it might already be in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master  
15 Plan, because there is a Complete Streets policy that the  
16 Town has, it may already be in there, but I wouldn't add it  
17 into the General Plan, so that's my opinion on that.  
18 Commissioner Clark, did you have comments or questions?

19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I agree. I think I'd like to  
20 see 62 and 63 as implementation programs. I hear a lot  
21 about VTA and I think collaboration with the VTA is really  
22 important, and I'm involved with them separately, and it  
23 feels like there needs to be more merging of the worlds and  
24 like it's really possible, so I think that would be great.  
25 I think that 67 looks good.

1 I had one thing I wanted to bring up about  
2 Implementation Program D, the community shuttle system. I  
3 felt like the focus on parking mostly focused on  
4 accommodating more cars and making sure that there's more  
5 parking, and Staff and I think that there wasn't as much  
6 focus as I would theoretically like to see on reducing the  
7 need for parking, and I think that the community shuttle  
8 system could be a really interesting way to do this. The  
9 only thing I wanted to bring up for this is I definitely  
10 would not expect it to be implemented before 2026, but I  
11 would like to see work on it happen before then because of  
12 how long this program might take, and so I wanted to  
13 include for Staff and Council to consider moving the  
14 timeline up for the community shuttle system.

15 CHAIR HANSEN: I think that's a reasonable request to  
16 consider moving up the timeline, especially when we see  
17 that there's going to be big, huge impacts from greenhouse  
18 gas from a transportation perspective, irrespective of the  
19 fact that it happens in every General Plan. With planning  
20 for 2,000 units, it's going to be an issue, so I don't have  
21 a problem with recommending moving up the priority of it.

22 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Could I just ask a clarifying  
23 question? The implementation program is already 2020-2025,  
24 and I was just confused by your comments, Commissioner  
25 Clark, because you're saying, if I'm reading it correctly,

1 you want the implementation timeline to change from 2026 to  
2 2025, but it already is, I think.

3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, on mine it shows it under  
4 2026-2040, and if it isn't, if it's on the earlier one,  
5 then I think that's great.

6 JOEL PAULSON: Just for clarification, it is currently  
7 marked in the 2026-2040 timeframe.

8 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Okay, so I have an older  
9 version.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, so then your recommendation  
11 would stand to move it into the 2020-2025 priority.

12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Good catch, Commissioner Janoff.  
13 Thank you for bringing that up.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: I do have a couple of questions to  
15 ask. One was on 58, which was brought up by one of the  
16 speakers, make downtown streets bike and pedestrian only,  
17 and while you guys said not recommended, is there any merit  
18 to studying to make it less car dependent, or do we have  
19 that covered in another implementation program?

20 LAUREL PREVETTI: I'll start, and I'm sure Staff will  
21 add on. We have in our Capital Improvement Program a  
22 downtown streetscape project that is a placeholder really  
23 for after the pandemic ends and as we start getting more  
24 revenue from different sources, so that's really part of a  
25 comprehensive evaluation of our streetscape and looking at

1 redesign, and that's already in our program. I don't think  
2 we need to add it, because I think there's already interest  
3 in making sure that we can widen sidewalks and make that  
4 major street more accessible for all modes of travel, so  
5 it's something that's actually already in more a short-term  
6 work plan; we're just waiting to get enough resources to  
7 hire a landscape architect and help us design it.

8 CHAIR HANSSEN: I kind of thought that from the  
9 General Plan Advisory Committee discussions that we had  
10 clearly identified things in that realm as what we needed  
11 to do, not just for downtown but for some other places, to  
12 raise the safety and usability for all modes of  
13 transportation, not just cars, so I thought we were  
14 covered. I only wanted to bring it up, because we had one  
15 of our commenters bring it up and it was on this list here  
16 even though it wasn't recommended, and so I understand that  
17 now.

18 I had another question about number 60, and Staff did  
19 respond that adding off-ramps from Highway 85 to Winchester  
20 was outside of the purview of the Los Gatos General Plan,  
21 but in the past I have seen where we did say we would  
22 coordinate with regional agencies if we thought it was our  
23 priority, and I'm not saying it is, I'm just asking the  
24 question. Is that something we should consider to lobby  
25 for?

1 LAUREL PREVETTI: The needs of the highway system in  
2 Silicon Valley are so great that it's just not going to  
3 happen, quite honestly. There's already a study going on  
4 about Highway 85 and how to improve efficiencies, and I  
5 think we're even having difficulty coming to agreement  
6 about how to make that artery more effective and perhaps  
7 introducing a transit. There's so much that we have that's  
8 needed. This would be one of those action items that we  
9 just would not be able to implement.

10 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Got it. It's not even clear how much  
11 difference it would make anyway, but I wanted to at least  
12 ask the question so that we can say that we asked the  
13 question.

14 One last question I had was about the paid parking. We  
15 are silent in the General Plan about paid parking, and  
16 there was a parking study done and I understand we're  
17 implementing on that, and my only question for Staff is by  
18 being silent about paying for parking are we putting  
19 ourselves in conflict with current policies, or is it  
20 better to just stay silent about it?

21 LAUREL PREVETTI: The Town Council is already moving  
22 forward on paid parking, and that's actually on the agenda  
23 for next Tuesday, so there's no reason for the 2040 plan to  
24 get into that level of detail.

25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: So there won't be any conflict,  
2 because we're not saying that you shouldn't charge for  
3 parking either, we're just silent about it, so there's no  
4 conflict. Okay, good then. I'm good.

5 That was all my questions, so then I think we had a  
6 motion from Commissioner Janoff to adopt 67 and 62 and 63  
7 as implementation programs, is that correct?

8 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: As one program.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: As one program, yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I just wanted to note that  
11 Commissioner Raspe had his hand up a little bit ago.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'm sorry; I missed that, so  
13 Commissioner Raspe.

14 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Thank you, Chair. Actually you  
15 asked the question I had with respect to the parking  
16 studies, so thank you for asking, and my question has been  
17 answered. Thank you much.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: So we have a motion from Commissioner  
19 Janoff, but Commissioner Thomas and Commissioner Clark have  
20 their hands up. Did you have more comments before we do the  
21 second? We can do that. Commissioner Thomas.

22 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I do. I also wanted to, if  
23 Commissioner Janoff is okay with it, change Implementation  
24 Program D to 2020-2025, to that timeframe, and include that  
25 in the motion.

1 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes, that's acceptable to the  
2 maker of the motion.

3 CHAIR HANSSEN: So is that a second, Commissioner  
4 Thomas?

5 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: All right, and then Commissioner  
7 Clark, did you have anything else now that that was added?

8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's exactly what I was going  
9 to say, thank you.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: So then let's go ahead, unless anyone  
11 has any other comments on mobility or anything else that  
12 they recommend changing, and take our roll call vote, and  
13 I'll start with Commissioner Thomas.

14 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

16 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Raspe.

18 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

20 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

21 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

24 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

25 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I vote yes as well.

1           So we've gotten through the Mobility Element. Let's at  
2 least start on the next one. It is 10:47, and so we'll see  
3 where we are at 11:00 and decide whether we should keep  
4 going or we should adjourn to another meeting. I think that  
5 is the point where I had thought that we would at least  
6 decide whether we would keep going, but I don't see any  
7 scenario where we're going to finish all of the elements  
8 tonight, but I think we could probably get the next  
9 element. Ms. Armer.

10           JENNIFER ARMER: I just wanted to clarify that if the  
11 discussion is going beyond 11:00p.m. we will need a motion,  
12 specifically to continue the meeting past that time.

13           CHAIR HANSSEN: There weren't an incredible amount of  
14 changes. Well, there actually were quite a few, but let's  
15 start on it and then at 11:00 o'clock I'll stop if we're  
16 not finished with the Public Facilities, Services, and  
17 Infrastructure Element. I'll stop there and then we'll  
18 decide if we continue to finish that or defer to the next  
19 meeting.

20           The Public Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure  
21 Element, there are quite a number of changes in my review,  
22 but I thought most of them were pretty reasonable, but we  
23 ought to discuss what we wanted to add. I had a question on  
24 69, which was considering the following additions. I don't  
25 know that I even knew what MWENDO is. I tried looking for

1 it and I didn't see it in the General Plan, but maybe I  
2 missed it.

3 JENNIFER ARMER: I believe that may be indicating  
4 Water Efficient Ordinance. Maybe it was a typo in their  
5 letter.

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: So it came from Valley Water?

7 JENNIFER ARMER: I can look up what the wording of  
8 that policy is and see if that makes sense.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: Because they had four different  
10 suggestions. It was consider adopting the MWENDO; encourage  
11 non-potable reuse of water, like gray water and rain water,  
12 which we don't have in there now; require dedicated  
13 landscape meters where applicable; and require installation  
14 of separate sub-meters in each unit of multi-family  
15 developments within commercial buildings, and you guys had  
16 said on the lot of those that you were neutral.

17 JENNIFER ARMER: This is adding a lot of detail to a  
18 goal. The goal is kind of the highest level when you've got  
19 goals, policies, and implementation measures, but if that  
20 additional detail is something that the Planning Commission  
21 feels is important to recommend, it could be part of that.  
22 I do think they may have intended that to be water  
23 efficient landscape, but we could look into that. Clearly  
24 they are talking about water efficiency.

25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: You made a good point that that goal  
2 is about water efficiency overall and how far in the weeds  
3 are we going to get in terms of policies. The Town Manager  
4 has her camera on.

5 LAUREL PREVETTI: Thanks to the teamwork of the  
6 participants that are watching the meeting, it is the Model  
7 Water Efficient New Development Ordinance.

8 CHAIR HANSSEN: That makes sense to me, because of  
9 what else is covered in there, but like I said, I didn't  
10 see it. I tried flipping through them and it wasn't in the  
11 General Plan right now, so I thought it was probably in  
12 something else that I hadn't seen or had missed.  
13 Commissioner Janoff and then Commissioner Thomas.

14 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I didn't have an issue with  
15 including these, but I wouldn't modify the goal EFS-1 if  
16 they should be incorporated under some of the policies  
17 without substantially changing what the GPAC worked really  
18 hard on refining. I could keep them or leave them out,  
19 either way. I thought number 70 was a good recommendation.  
20 I agree with all those that are not recommended.

21 The question that I had with the two or three items  
22 that refer to the connection between Los Gatos-Saratoga  
23 Rec, we didn't really get into that level of detail  
24 specifically saying who is providing child care, so I would  
25 think that those kind of comments, that would be 72,

1 possibly 73, possibly 74, is too far into the weeds and  
2 things might change over 20 years and who knows if LGS is  
3 going to still be around. We don't want this to be dated at  
4 any point if we can help it, so I would not recommend  
5 those, even though Staff is recommending... Well, you're  
6 recommending something else with regard to the figure;  
7 that's fine. Number 75, we had a lot of input from the  
8 Senior Services Commission, anything related to senior, so  
9 as with many things, the GPAC deferred to those who were  
10 experts in their area. If we didn't get this comment from  
11 the Senior Services Commission, I'm not sure, so I put no  
12 against that one.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think you have a good point on that.  
14 I mean, we had them come to our meeting, they sent in  
15 written comments, and this sounds like it came from LGS  
16 Recreation saying we're doing all this stuff and we're not  
17 being recognized in the General Plan is what I am getting  
18 out of the comments.

19 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: That's how I read these several  
20 comments and I don't think the General Plan is the place  
21 for that, so I'm just cautioning against that. Number 76,  
22 once again we've got an acronym that hasn't been spelled  
23 out, or at least I don't know what CPTED means.

24 CHAIR HANSSEN: It's in the General Plan right now, by  
25 the way. Is that in their definitions?

1 JENNIFER ARMER: Yes, it's Crime Prevention Through  
2 Environmental Design, but it is defined.

3 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I would say no on 77, "Encourage  
4 the private facility or community center to host performing  
5 arts events." I don't think we need to add "or community  
6 center," especially since we don't have one, I don't think,  
7 at the moment. Number 79, if we want to do more for the  
8 plant-based diet contingent in Town, then maybe, but how  
9 would we implement that is my question. Who is adding the  
10 trees, and if it's routing trees to Town property, what  
11 Staff is going to maintain and what do you have to do to  
12 keep the trees working? That seemed like a very specific  
13 thing and a great idea, but not so easily implemented.  
14 That's all I have.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Did you have a comment on 80? They  
16 wanted to add dark sky conservation and healthy ecosystems  
17 to the existing implementation program for outdoor  
18 lighting.

19 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I was okay with adding that.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: I was as well. Let's see, I'm not sure  
21 between Commissioner Thomas and Commissioner Clark who had  
22 their hand up first. Let's go with Commissioner Thomas.

23 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you. In general I agree  
24 with Commissioner Janoff's comments, so thank you for that.  
25 For number 69, I believe that we need to add a definition

1 of "recycled water" to the list of definitions, because  
2 when I read the goals I felt like gray water, rainwater,  
3 and storm water collection were covered in it already, but  
4 I don't know, so I feel like we just need to add that  
5 definition. What do we mean by recycled water? Gray water  
6 is typically what we mean by recycled water, so if that  
7 could be added to clarify, I think that would address some  
8 of the issues with number 69. I also very much support  
9 number 80, but I don't feel super strongly about the other  
10 parts.

11 CHAIR HANSEN: Commissioner Clark, and then  
12 Commissioner Tavana.

13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. Yes, I also generally  
14 agree. I think for number 69 that these can be fit under  
15 some of those policies under the goal. For example, for  
16 "encourage non-potable reuse of water," I think that could  
17 fit under Policy 1.5, Sustainable Water Use, and so I think  
18 that that's probably something to explore with that one,  
19 but I don't think that they should be added as their own  
20 policies. I agree with the stand the Commissioners have  
21 taken on the other ones. For number 76 I think definitely  
22 no for that one. I think that that wording was there for a  
23 reason and I wouldn't support taking that out.

24 Then for number 79, the fruit trees, I want to ask  
25 Staff, because they were neutral on it, if that is

1 possible? I agree it's a great idea, but I also have a hard  
2 time seeing how that would be implemented and maintained.

3 I have a second question for Staff. I was wondering  
4 for number 80 where it adds dark sky conservation, is this  
5 the only place in the General Plan where this would be  
6 implemented? It would also go in like Open Space and Parks  
7 or something, right?

8 JENNIFER ARMER: Yes, dark sky is included in some of  
9 the other sections. In Design of New Buildings, for  
10 example, we've got at least one policy that does include  
11 reference to dark sky.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think Community Design for sure.

13 JENNIFER ARMER: Yeah, there definitely we added it to  
14 a policy specifically in response to those public comments.  
15 In response to the question about the fruit trees, the idea  
16 of having additional fruit trees in Town, we're neutral on  
17 that. It was one of the less specific recommendations or  
18 comments, so how exactly I think the implementation of that  
19 is, it's something that's added to an existing policy. They  
20 talk about possibly under Section 6.13, so a little bit of  
21 a question there as to how you might see implementing that,  
22 but I could see it being part of if there were some local  
23 farms activities. We definitely like to support the Town's  
24 history of the orchards in Town.

25

1           It looks like Community Development Director Paulson  
2 has something to add.

3           JOEL PAULSON: The first thing I'll add is it is 11:00  
4 o'clock. The second thing I'll add is that we'll look into  
5 that more. Ultimately, that's going to be a resource issue.  
6 We're not going to be looking to create orchard facilities  
7 or some of the farming activities like they're proposing to  
8 do on the North Forty where they're going to have someone  
9 actively monitor that. That would be problematic, but we'll  
10 get some more information before we come back for the next  
11 meeting. We will need a motion to extend past 11:00 to a  
12 specific time, and then we can see where that goes.

13          CHAIR HANSSEN: Should I make the motion or should I  
14 ask someone to make the motion? What I'd like to suggest to  
15 the Commission is that we try to finish this particular  
16 element, and then adjourn to another meeting. Do we need to  
17 do the date certain right now?

18          JOEL PAULSON: You don't need to do the date certain  
19 now, but we need to do it before you close this evening.

20          CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, got it.

21          JOEL PAULSON: First motion is to extend it.

22          CHAIR HANSSEN: And it has to be a specific time?

23          JENNIFER ARMER: And you then would have the  
24 opportunity when we get to that time to extend it further,  
25 if you so wish.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'm going to just suggest 11:30, but  
2 if we finish this element before that I would want to stop  
3 and get to the next meeting, so that's my proposal.  
4 Commissioner Tavana.

5 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I move to extend the meeting  
6 till 11:30.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, thank you. Is there a second?  
8 Commissioner Raspe, it looks like you're seconding?

9 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes, I'll second that motion.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: All right, and then we will take our  
11 roll call vote. Commissioner Thomas.

12 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

14 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Raspe.

16 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

18 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

21 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

22 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I vote yes as well. So then we  
24 also had the hands up from our Staff. Mr. Kim, did you have  
25 something you wanted to say?

1           WOOJAE KIM: Yes, thank you, Chair. Regarding the goal  
2 for the fruit trees and so forth, I definitely believe more  
3 evaluation analysis might be needed, getting our Town  
4 Arborist involved. This element is under Public Facilities  
5 and Services, so I think if we're talking about planting  
6 fruit trees on public lands we would definitely need to  
7 evaluate that further to see if we could maintain such  
8 trees and if those would be ideal in public spaces.

9           Also, a separate comment about gray water. Again, in  
10 public facilities and maybe parks we do have to evaluate if  
11 that's even feasible or not, because I know there are  
12 purple pipes of recycled water, that's a possibility, but  
13 that is not even a feasible option at this time because of  
14 lack of quantities of recycled water available out there in  
15 the county.

16           CHAIR HANSSEN: That's very helpful. So some of the  
17 things that are suggested in 69, what I'm hearing, are not  
18 really practical. Let's see, I have a few hands up. I'll go  
19 with Commissioner Raspe, because he's waving at me, and  
20 then we also have Commissioner Tavana, who had his hand up  
21 before, and then Commissioner Thomas.

22           COMMISSIONER RASPE: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I  
23 agree generally with all comments made, especially with  
24 respect to some comments noting that some of these

25

1 notations may be dated, so we should be a little careful in  
2 the language that we include.

3       Specifically I want to talk about the last bullet  
4 point in Section 69 requiring installation of separate sub-  
5 meters in multi-family developments. I think it's inferred  
6 but not stated that that should be applicable to new  
7 developments. I don't think we want to create a retrofit  
8 obligation to our existing units, so I think we'll need  
9 some clarifying language in that bullet.

10       CHAIR HANSSSEN: And that's only if we choose to  
11 recommend it, period. It is a choice to decide not to  
12 recommend it, so I appreciate that.

13       I would add on that the one before it requiring  
14 dedicated landscape meters where applicable, the applicable  
15 would be the big question, because to take on having to  
16 retrofit the entire Town with dedicated landscape meters, I  
17 can't speak for everyone, but we have a San Jose water  
18 meter at the street and if I want to see what our water  
19 usage is I just open the thing up and I can see what our  
20 water usage is. To do that seems like a lot to take on, and  
21 I'm not sure where it would take us. Commissioner Tavana.

22       COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Thank you, Chair. Just a quick  
23 two comments actually.

24  
25

1           Speaking to comment 69, I wouldn't recommend any list  
2 changes. I'd like to keep the language as is currently  
3 written.

4           Secondly, in terms of the implementation programs,  
5 this is a new comment I wanted to throw out there and that  
6 I would like to see personally move up the implementation  
7 timeline for Program C to 2025. There's a lot of talk in  
8 Town right now about this notion of artificial turf being  
9 somehow more environmentally friendly than real grass. I  
10 think we should have this study happen sooner rather than  
11 later, in my opinion.

12           CHAIR HANSSEN: To decide if that's the case? I don't  
13 know if you saw that there were multiple comments in the  
14 Staff Report totally advocating for stopping any more  
15 artificial turf in Town, period, and including maybe taking  
16 out the stuff that's at the Los Gatos Creekside Park.

17           COMMISSIONER TAVANA: That's great news. I can tell  
18 you the windfall from the North Forty, there is budget, and  
19 all the local schools, Van Meter, Daves, they're going to  
20 put in artificial turf for some reason at these elementary  
21 schools, so needless to say, I would like to see this study  
22 happen sooner rather than later.

23           CHAIR HANSSEN: So you're adding in a recommendation  
24 that isn't on the list that we have here to move up the  
25 priority of studying the artificial turf?

1 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Right.

2 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, so duly noted, and we can decide  
3 if we can move forward with that, but that makes sense.

4 Were there other comments that you had?

5 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: That was it. Thank you.

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: I lost track of who was next, so let's  
7 go with Commissioner Thomas, and then Commissioner Janoff,  
8 and then Commissioner Clark.

9 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you, Commissioner Tavana,  
10 for that comment. I do agree that Implementation Program C  
11 needs to be moved up, and maybe within that we need to have  
12 alternatives to just regular sod essentially also, because  
13 that is not going to be the good solution moving forward  
14 water-wise either, so maybe this implementation program  
15 needs to be changed to just studying what the appropriate  
16 ground cover needs to be in places where turf is needed,  
17 then that would cover the use of artificial turf but also  
18 hopefully cover some more sustainable and environmental and  
19 (inaudible) alternatives.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yeah, that's related to the water.

21 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes, and people. I think that  
22 that's some of the concern of artificial turf.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

24 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Completely in agreement with  
25 what was just discussed on Implementation Program C, and I

1 am also in agreement with Commissioner Tavana that we  
2 should not incorporate any of the changes recommended in  
3 69. It seems like the more people from the Town speak, the  
4 less likely these are viable recommendations to implement,  
5 so my recommendation would be to not incorporate any of 69  
6 to follow on Commissioner Tavana's recommendation.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: The good news is that by keeping it  
8 general it doesn't preclude the Town from pursuing any of  
9 these avenues under the guise of water efficiency, because  
10 that is our goal. How we go about doing it is still open.  
11 That makes sense, so I like that as a resolution. Let's  
12 see, Commissioner Clark.

13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I agree about Implementation  
14 Program C moving up the timeline. I also like Commissioner  
15 Thomas' change to also studying what the appropriate ground  
16 cover needs to be, and I agree on number 69. For number 79,  
17 the fruit trees, I would like to include a recommendation  
18 to Council to explore including this in the plan. I don't  
19 think that we should even actually include it, but I think  
20 that that might be something worth looking into in the time  
21 between now and their review.

22 CHAIR HANSSEN: Would you want to have an added  
23 implementation program to study the feasibility of doing  
24 it, or just send it off to Council saying that it sounds  
25 like a good idea but we're not sure where to put it?

1           COMMISSIONER CLARK: I definitely don't think we  
2 should add it as another implementation program.

3           CHAIR HANSSSEN: Because we have a hundred and some.

4           COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, it seems like we have  
5 enough work to do. I think since we don't even know if it's  
6 feasible, that's another reason not to put it as one, but I  
7 think it is something worth looking into and then  
8 considering including in the General Plan if it does turn  
9 out to be completely feasible.

10          CHAIR HANSSSEN: Great, got it. Commissioner Janoff.

11          COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I think one thing we want to  
12 keep in mind is that the Housing Element gives us an  
13 opportunity to get more detailed about how we want to  
14 construct neighborhoods and affordable housing that  
15 supports the residents. We had a great piece during our  
16 study session last week. What was it called, agri-hood? It  
17 was a low-income neighborhood built by Core, and it  
18 included a whole agricultural garden and whatnot to support  
19 the residents. I think this would be a great idea to  
20 include in the Housing Element when we get there to  
21 incentivize sort of the holistic affordable housing, low-  
22 income housing concept, so don't lose it. I don't think  
23 this is the right place for it. Put it someplace where it  
24 can actually do what I think they're getting at, which is  
25 we've got this opportunity to grow food for our community.

1 Let's put it where it makes more sense to do that, and  
2 maybe it winds up being a public/private partnership or  
3 something that's a requirement for developers, I don't  
4 know, but don't lose it, but not in this section.

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, sounds good. Commissioner  
6 Thomas.

7 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I agree, and I think that it can  
8 even be expanded to not just fruit trees, but in general  
9 just everything edible.

10 I feel like I'm ready to make a motion if people don't  
11 have a ton of other comments.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think we're fine. I just wanted to  
13 double check, because Commissioner Janoff might have  
14 mentioned it earlier, but number 70, since Staff was  
15 recommending it, would that be part of your motion to  
16 include it?

17 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: (Nods yes.)

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, go ahead.

19 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I move to forward the Public  
20 Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure Element with the  
21 following changes: add a definition of recycled and  
22 reclaimed water; change Implementation Program C up to the  
23 2025-2025 timeline and expand it to looking at artificial  
24 turf alternatives and groundcover alternatives; accept

25

1 number 70; accept number 80; and I believe Commissioner  
2 Janoff also said number 73.

3 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, that's your motion, and do we  
4 have a second? Commissioner Clark.

5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I second.

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think we've made a ton of comments,  
7 so I will go ahead and take the roll call vote, and I'll  
8 start with Commissioner Thomas.

9 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

11 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Raspe.

13 COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

15 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

19 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I vote yes as well. So we've  
21 gotten through several elements, and I'm suggesting that we  
22 will stop here and pick up with Open Space, Parks, and  
23 Recreation at our next meeting, which will be a date  
24 certain. Staff had polled all of us to determine a couple  
25 of possible date certain. One date certain was tomorrow.

1 That is absolutely a non-starter for me, and I don't know  
2 if there are other Commissioners that can't do tomorrow.  
3 The other date that they have told us about was the 20<sup>th</sup>,  
4 which is a week from today, and we would definitely not  
5 have, I believe, two Commissioners for that. When talking  
6 with Staff today they surfaced a couple of other  
7 possibilities. Remind me, Ms. Armer. I think you said the  
8 18<sup>th</sup>, which is a Monday, and the 25<sup>th</sup>.

9 JENNIFER ARMER: The other two options, it's correct,  
10 it looks like we would likely have five Commissioners join  
11 us if we did it tomorrow night, but also a slightly  
12 different five if we went for Wednesday the 20<sup>th</sup>. The other  
13 two options would be 7:00 o'clock Monday, April 18<sup>th</sup>. The  
14 Senior Services Commission has a special meeting at 5:00  
15 o'clock, but we expect they would be done by 7:00. Or  
16 Monday, April 25<sup>th</sup>. The Finance Commission has a special  
17 meeting at 5:00 o'clock, but again, it's likely they would  
18 be done by 7:00, so that is also viable, but we don't know  
19 whether the Commissioners are available for those. Another  
20 point is that it wouldn't necessarily have to be a 7:00  
21 o'clock in the evening meeting now that we have completed  
22 the comments from the public, if there is another time of  
23 day that works for a majority of the Commissioners, that is  
24 also an option.

25 CHAIR HANSEN: You mean like meeting earlier?

1 JENNIFER ARMER: Correct.

2 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Although we have several Commissioners  
3 that are working Commissioners, so I'm not sure if that  
4 would be feasible. I'm not clear on the best way to proceed  
5 on this. Should we list the number of dates and have people  
6 vote which ones they could make? I'm not comfortable based  
7 on the polling of those original two dates that we had  
8 enough alternatives that we'd get enough of us here to make  
9 sense.

10 JOEL PAULSON: I'll just interject. Obviously, we're  
11 going to make the motion. I'm not sure we're going to find  
12 a date that's going to work for everyone, frankly, but  
13 ultimately just do a quick raise of hands of folks who  
14 would be available on the 18<sup>th</sup>, and do a quick raise of  
15 hands of people who are going to be available on the 25<sup>th</sup>,  
16 and if everyone raised their hand, then we'll look for a  
17 motion. It looks like Commissioner Tavana has a comment.

18 CHAIR HANSSSEN: Go ahead, Commissioner Tavana.

19 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I was just going to say the best  
20 day that would work for me is the 20<sup>th</sup>. I was going to start  
21 there and you can see what else works for everybody else.

22 JENNIFER ARMER: I will add that if the 20<sup>th</sup> does work  
23 for Commissioner Tavana, I think that does bring us up to  
24 six. Then it would be Commissioner Thomas is the only one  
25 unavailable on the 20<sup>th</sup>.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: Can we get a quick show of hands on  
2 who would be available on the 18<sup>th</sup> to see if we could get to  
3 seven? I don't know if we can or not. I can do it.

4 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Can I ask a question very  
5 quickly?

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: Go ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: What time again was proposed?

8 CHAIR HANSSEN: Let's do a starting of 7:00 o'clock  
9 like our normal meeting, but we have done special meetings  
10 where we start at 6:00 before. Given what they said about  
11 the special meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> of the Senior Services  
12 Commission, probably starting at 6:00 wouldn't be as easy  
13 of an option as starting at 7:00, so I would just probably  
14 say 7:00.

15 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I'm out of town next week, so  
16 I'm just looking at my calendar for what time on Wednesday,  
17 because I might be able to make that work, but let's see  
18 what works for everyone.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: If it's Wednesday the 20<sup>th</sup>, it's  
20 certainly possible that we could start at 6:00 instead of  
21 7:00. I didn't hear from Staff that there's another  
22 conflicting meeting that day that they have to support.  
23 Wednesday is the day we normally meet, so I don't think  
24 there are other meetings that day.

25

1           Let me go back to the 18<sup>th</sup> and a show of hands on who  
2 could make it on the 18<sup>th</sup>. So we've got six of us for the  
3 18<sup>th</sup>, and we wouldn't have Commissioner Tavana, so it comes  
4 down to either the 18<sup>th</sup> or the 20<sup>th</sup>, and we could check on  
5 the 25<sup>th</sup>. A show of hands on who could make it on the 25<sup>th</sup>.  
6 We still have it looks like six. We have six. Oh, seven.

7           COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I'll be in a different time  
8 zone, but I would chime in.

9           CHAIR HANSSEN: I have the same issue on the 25<sup>th</sup>. I'm  
10 going to be out of town, but I can get on Zoom, it's not a  
11 problem. I'm going to make a proposal that we make the date  
12 certain the 25<sup>th</sup> since we could have all seven of us  
13 available. I'm proposing a date certain of Monday, April  
14 25<sup>th</sup>, and we would start at 7:00 Pacific time. Do I have a  
15 second? Vice Chair Barnett.

16           VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I second that.

17           CHAIR HANSSEN: Let's see, I will just take the roll  
18 call vote. Commissioner Thomas.

19           COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

20           CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

21           COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

22           CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Raspe.

23           COMMISSIONER RASPE: Yes.

24           CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

25

1 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes, but I have a question. If  
2 people are out of town on a different time zone and the  
3 Senior Services Commission is probably not meeting on the  
4 25<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup>, is somebody else meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>?

5 CHAIR HANSSEN: The Finance Commission is meeting on  
6 the 25<sup>th</sup>.

7 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Do you think that would allow a  
8 6:00 o'clock start? No. I'm available for a yes.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

11 CHAIR HANSSEN: And then Vice Chair Barnett.

12 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I vote yes as well. What we  
14 proposed was a 7:00 o'clock start time, but if Staff let's  
15 us know that we can start an hour earlier, I don't think it  
16 will be a problem, so let's put the thing that we voted on  
17 out there now. It would make it late for any of us on the  
18 East Coast. I'll be in the Central time zone, so it will be  
19 9:00 o'clock that we start, but that's okay. To me, it's  
20 more important to have everyone there so that we can finish  
21 our discussion.

22 I want to thank everyone for all their time and effort  
23 that they put in tonight, and we did make some decent  
24 progress on the General Plan. We hopefully can finish up at  
25 our next meeting that's scheduled for Monday April 25<sup>th</sup>.