

CITY OF SAN JOSE

CHARCOT AVENUE EXTENSION PROJECT

COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Summary of Community Outreach Meeting

Wednesday March 22, 2017

The City of San Jose hosted a community stakeholder outreach meeting on March 22st, 2017 from 6:00-8:15 p.m. to discuss and present a new project to improve mobility. The project would provide a multimodal connection across Interstate 880 between Oakland Road in the east and O'Toole Avenue in the west. The meeting was held at Orchard School Event Center, 921 Fox Lane in San Jose. Approximately 70 community members attended the meeting and a total of 51 people signed into the meeting. In addition, Councilmember Lan Diep attended the meeting, supported by his staff, Ana Paz-Rangel and Chris Rork, along with the Orchard School District Superintendent and several of the School Board members, and Mario Lopes of County Board of Supervisor David Cortese's office.

City staff John Ristow, Deputy Director of the Department of Transportation, Division Manager Zahir Gulzadah, Associate Engineer Liza Gonzalez, Senior Engineer Thuy Nguyen, and Engineer Neil Ong attended the meeting. Meenaxi Panakkal represented the City's Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department. Natalina Bernardi, BKF Engineers Project Manager, Gordon Sweet, BKF Engineers Deputy Project Manager, John Hesler David Powers and Associates, Environmental Lead, and Robert del Rio, Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Traffic Lead and Eileen Goodwin Apex Strategies, Community Outreach Lead represented the project team.

This was the first community outreach meeting with members of the public regarding this phase of the project. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information about the project; describe the approval process that will occur, inform the community of up-coming opportunities to provide input and answer questions.

Meeting Summary:

After a half hour open house, where community members could ask questions of the project team, the formal meeting and presentation started at 6:30 p.m. After a brief introduction by the facilitator, the City's Deputy Director of Transportation introduced the team in attendance and thanked the attendees for coming. The project team spoke to a PowerPoint to orient the attendees to the purpose of the project, history of the project, the environmental process and some proposed alternatives under consideration as well as the project schedule. There was opportunity for many questions to be addressed.

During the meeting, the facilitator conducted a few informal surveys with the crowd and estimated the responses given by a show of hands. A summary of those surveys are as follows:

When asked how many in attendance had been aware of the meeting held with the City and Orchard School during the previous preliminary Charcot Extension project study efforts in 2009, none replied that they were.

When asked how the attendees heard about the meeting, the responses were as follows:

- Approximately 60% of the attendees recalled receiving mailed meeting notices which included the meeting details;
- No one recalled receiving the City e-blast;
- Seventy percent recalled getting an email from the School District; and
- Approximately one-third of the attendees heard about the meeting from NextDoor.

Note: The percentages above exceed 100% because some attendees may have heard from more than one source.

After the presentation, many questions, suggestions and opinions were offered to the staff and project team. The comments and responses offered during the meeting are captured below in the order they were given.

At the very end of the meeting Councilmember Diep made brief remarks, thanked people for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Comment/Question	Response
As a teacher at the school I have the following concerns: 1) playground protection, will there be barriers? 2) the health of the children breathing more exhaust. Will you be measuring the emissions to a children's standard?	The issue of barrier protection has been raised in the team's discussions with the school. The project would be adding curb and gutter which will keep lower speed cars on the street the team can look at barriers or walls. The community should be aware that Charcot will be back to the grade it is today in front of the playground area. We will be quantifying the emissions by category following the air districts protocols. As for whether there is a separate standard for children form adults we will need to research that.

<p>What will be the impact to the morning drop -off that currently occurs on Charcot on the “back side” of the school?</p>	<p>The opportunity for passenger loading and unloading is right-of-way dependent, if the school wants to consider such a drop-off we will need to work with them to find right of way on the Orchard School Site for its construction. It could be designated as a drop-off or loading zone. We will be making additional improvements for bike safety along Silkwood Lane. A flashing beacon style crossing may also be possible to make the pedestrian crossing safer.</p>
<p>The other side of Charcot the street is narrow by the creek bridge will that be changed?</p>	<p>No, that is not a project element for this project.</p>
<p>I work in the School District office and have three questions; 1) who are ‘stakeholders?’ 2) Who ultimately votes on the project, yes or no, up or down? 3) If we do find pollution then what?</p>	<p>Stakeholders are the community, the school, the local businesses and other interested parties.</p> <p>The City council is the ultimate decision making body for this project.</p> <p>The environmental process requires disclosure of all adverse impacts. It also requires the project to provide mitigations where feasible and if no mitigations can reduce the impacts that must also be disclosed to the community and decision making body. If the decision makers choose to move forward with the project they would need to formally acknowledge and go on record regarding the impacts that cannot be fully mitigated.</p>
<p>Concerned about safety on Silkwood and that the project is moving the lanes on Charcot closer to the school. When this project was planned, there were not as many residents in the area.</p>	<p>Yes, the project could be moving the road closer to the school. The final configuration has not been set.</p>

Summary of March 22, 2017 Community Stakeholder Meeting

<p>Traffic is like water. How will the traffic be managed? Will there be adaptive signals? ITS and other technologies used?</p>	<p>Yes, ITS and other traffic management technologies, such as adaptive signals, will be taken into consideration by the project.</p>
<p>We need to find out an answer about the air quality standards and children's limits because we, as a society, have made assumptions about safety that did not turn out well such as radiation and lead paint. I am particularly concerned about the children at the school who have respiratory problems already.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments we will need to do more research on these topics as part of the environmental process.</p>
<p>Concerned about moving the baseball field. Maybe the changes are too much. Maybe this is a political question. Maybe it is insurmountable maybe it is not.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Will there be a traffic light at Silkwood Avenue and Oakland Road?</p> <p>Will there be parking allowed along Charcot?</p>	<p>That is likely but will need to be evaluated in the traffic analysis.</p> <p>Due to the bicycle lane element of the project, parking will not be allowed along Charcot in this area.</p>
<p>Is reconfiguring the school drop -off part of the Charcot Extension Project or not?</p>	<p>It is not an element at this time, however, the City would like to work with the School District to determine if they want a formal drop-off on Charcot and how it might be accommodated.</p>
<p>Will Charcot be marked as a school zone?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>If the project encroaches into the ballfield, what are the obligations there?</p>	<p>The City would need to acquire the right-of-way in some manner and provide mitigation by reconfiguring the ballfield or making some other accommodations. The City will be working directly with the school staff and Board to work through these issues.</p>

<p>This is not a reasonable project. If the people do not want it, how do they get it removed from the General Plan?</p>	<p>Just as there was a public process and studies done to add and affirm the project in the General Plan, there is a public process to remove projects from the Plan. Additionally, there would need to be analysis of what would happen to traffic patterns in the future without this link since it has been assumed in planning for future growth in the area. It is part of the North San Jose Development Plan. The project also includes elements to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety. It is ultimately a City Council decision.</p>
<p>What does this project solve? Where does it link?</p> <p>Improvements to Montague should be prioritized instead. There is a lot of development going in along Montague yet it does not get widened.</p>	<p>Brokaw and Montague take traffic from the area and funnel it to the Interstate 880 interchanges. This Charcot Extension project would allow your neighborhood to access across Interstate 880 without getting tied up in the congestion headed for the freeway.</p> <p>As for Montague, there are plans to widen it and the developments have been paying into a fund to pay for some additional widenings.</p>
<p>You should be talking about trip generation.</p>	<p>Unlike a development which adds new trips to the area a link such as the Charcot Extension redistributes traffic that is already within the larger area of the community. So, while there would be new trips in this specific area along Charcot they are the same trips that are currently using Brokaw, Montague and other area streets.</p>

<p>Concerned about a big bottleneck at the light. Those idling vehicles will cause a lot of pollution. There are already a lot of children with special needs that go to this school, these children are 20% of the school population. I am concerned about the health of the children. Concerned also about more trucks going past the school. Will there be a traffic ban?</p>	<p>Thank you for bringing these issues to our attention. At this time, we are not considering a truck ban for this area. The traffic study will give us more information about what percent of the traffic is expected to be truck traffic.</p>
<p>Why would the City grant the school the land here and then make this such a busy street?</p>	<p>The City did not control the school being built on this site in 1995. The School District Board controls where schools are located. The City does not have land use jurisdiction over school districts.</p>
<p>What about setting the housing here?</p>	<p>The City did control that land use decision. In the 1990's a strategic decision was made to take jobs and businesses planned for the area and swap them to a different part of San Jose in exchange for housing here in North San Jose. The hope was to make the City more balanced with housing and jobs spread around and hopefully reduce commute lengths as a result.</p> <p>The Charcot Extension was assumed in the environmental documents for the housing development.</p>
<p>Can this information be found on the website?</p>	<p>Yes, the City will provide the link to the housing development environmental document and planning information and the School District will also post this on their website.</p>
<p>Is there a way to have an alternative proposal from the community?</p>	<p>Yes, please submit something.</p>

<p>You are taking notes of this meeting. Will there be minutes produced? Will they be available?</p>	<p>Yes, these notes will be turned into a meeting summary of the meeting. The City has plans to build a website for this project to post the PowerPoint, meeting summary and other project materials. It is not created yet so please check back in a while. Please sign-in so we can let you know when it is up and running.</p>
<p>How do we come up with rebuttal statements to your reports?</p>	<p>When the draft environmental document is circulated in the summer you can provide formal comments rebutting something in the document and the process would be for the team to go back and reconsider that element to either reaffirm it or re-study it.</p>
<p>Was there a “Plan B” when this project was dreamed up back in 1994? If not, why not?</p>	<p>In 1994, City planners were looking at connections between facilities that would support future growth. As you may not be aware, in the early 1990’s this area was a big field. All subsequent development in the area such as the school, housing and businesses assumed this connection in their environmental review processes. So no, there is no “Plan B.” In addition, as we described in the timeline slide, this project has been reaffirmed as a preferred connection in the subsequent City Plans many times over since 1994.</p>
<p>If it is such an important link why hasn’t it been built before now?</p>	<p>The City has many projects to fund and the funding was not available until now to move the project forward.</p>
<p>What problem is this solving? Pressure reliever or what?</p>	<p>The traffic study analysis will make the need for the project clear. It is also important to note that the environmental process requires us to study a “No Build” alternative to show what happens to traffic in 2040 without the project.</p>

I think the \$30m allocated to this project should go elsewhere.	Comment noted.
Since we moved to this area the noise along Oakland Road has really increased. There is now ten times the traffic and that generates about five times as much noise as when we first moved here. Also, it used to be that there were times during the day when it was quiet. Not it is noisy all day and in the night. There are a lot of trucks on Oakland Road. This project would increase traffic and make it even more noisy and congested. It will also cause safety problems.	Comment noted.

Meeting summary created by Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies.