

Attachment D - Summary of public comments received

Item No.	Community Member/Agency	Comment/question	Staff response
1.	Cary Greene	The June 2008 draft of the Guadalupe Gardens Design Guidelines and Implementation Strategy by Royston Hanamoto Alley and Abey has not been approved by the City Council, therefore it's a work in progress and should be so noted in the Updated Greenprint.	So noted and staff will correct the text on page 44 to reflect the status of 2008 draft of the Guadalupe Gardens Design Guidelines and Implementation Strategy by Royston Hanamoto Alley and Abey
2.	Karin Arrigoni	Would like a dog park in Guadalupe Gardens	Proposed in the 2008 draft of the Guadalupe Gardens Design Guidelines and Implementation Strategy by Royston Hanamoto Alley and Abey that has not been approved by City Council per Note # 1.
3.	Bob Mack	Would like more neighborhood dog parks added to the plan	Currently the City has 8 dog parks. The City's goal is to provide at least one good sized dog park in each of the 11 Urban Planning Areas.
4.	Bob Mack	Create more bike lanes that connect residential areas	DOT is currently doubling the number of bike lanes in the City.
5.	Bob Mack	Require all public events to provide secure bicycle parking	This item is outside the realm of PRNS regarding all public events.
6.	David Machado	Would like a dog park in the Willow Glen area	So noted and see Note # 2.
7.	Leslie Marshall	Would like a dog park in the Willow Glen area	So noted.
8.	D8 Roundtable	Community center is a high priority	It is a Priority 1 in the Evergreen Action Plan, which mean that funding has yet to be defined for this project.
9.	D8 Roundtable	Dog park is a high priority (perhaps at Fowler Creek Park?)	A dog park is a Priority 2 in the Capital Action Plan for the Evergreen Planning Area. So noted regarding Fowler Creek Park as a possible location.
10.	D8 Roundtable	No good park options for neighborhood near Pleasant Hills Golf Course	Residential development of the golf course will trigger the PDO/PIO, which in turn will provide a neighborhood park.
11.	D8 Roundtable	Agree GRP is a good central park	So noted and see Note # 2.
12.	D8 Roundtable	Need a safe way to cross the freeway when using Thompson Creek Trail	The Thompson Creek Trails does not cross a freeway. The Trail does run parallel to a segment of Capitol Expressway by the Eastridge Shopping Center, which a pedestrian over crossing has been suggested. The approved 2005 Trail Master Plan for Thompson Creek does not proposed such a bridge crossing. Major street crossings will be done at signalized intersections.
13.	D8 Roundtable	Should have annual race around Lake Cunningham to raise money for trail development	Thank you for the suggestion, so noted.
14.	Michelle Baker	More dog parks	Please see Note # 3.

15.	Harriet Jakovina	Need dog park in Willow Glen	Please see Note # 3.
16.	Harriet Jakovina	Need Willow Glen Spur Trail immediately	Staff concurs that an east-west connection from the Guadalupe to the Coyote trail system in this area of the City is important to the trail network. The Greenprint Update indicates that we will continue to study alternatives and strive for this connection.
17.	Harriet Jakovina	Need clean bathrooms, could be portable ones and additional tables at River Glen Park	So noted.
18.	Harriet Jakovina	Need places to gather as a group	Staff considers these as part of the park master plan process and will continue to do so.
19.	Harriet Jakovina	Off-leash area near the section of the Guadalupe River Trail (near Taylor)	A dog park is proposed in the 2008 draft of the Guadalupe Gardens Design Guidelines and Implementation Strategy by Royston Hanamoto Alley and Abey that has not been approved by Council per Note # 1.
21.	Harriet Jakovina	Phone survey does not represent San Jose	The 1,000 telephone survey used a Random Digit Dial (RDD) Methodology and was offered in English, Spanish and Vietnamese. This methodology includes both listed and unlisted phone numbers. After the data collection was completed the results was weighted to accurately represent the adult (18 years and older) residents population for the City based on age, ethnicity and gender. The number of 736,185 was used to represent residents over 18 years (835 In English, 110 in Spanish and 55 in Vietnamese). The 1,000 completed telephone interviews can be generalized to San Jose's adult population within +/- 3.10%, given a 95% percent level of confidence.
22.	Debbie Cauble	Give consideration to more dog parks and evaluate the wide open spaces of Guadalupe River Park for large dog park	Please see Note # 18.
23.	Arambula Family	Desperately need a dog park in Willow Glen	Please see Note # 2.
24.	Jim Stallman	Complete the bay side HWY 237 bike path from Coyote Creek to Gold Street Connector which includes a bridge across the Guadalupe River.	A north side trail is not part of the adopted Trail Master Plan.
25.	Jim Stallman	Unlock and reopen the HWY 87 Bike Path Airport Segment.	Staff cannot consider reopening the gates since there is a parallel route on the west bank with safer crossings and visibility.
26.	Jim Stallman	Provide ped/bike direct access from Guadalupe Trail to Component Light Rail Station via Component Drive.	This can be addressed through the master plan process for the Component Trail.
27.	Hugh Graham	Consider planning and constructing the Los Gatos Creek Trail segment to fill the gap east of Meridian to Lincoln	So noted. The City may study this section in the future. The current Trail Master Plan for the area noted on the Los Gatos Trail is defined as a street alignment.
28.	Larry Ames	Retain the ratio of 3.5 acres/1,000 population	So noted for neighborhood and community serving parks.
29.	Larry Ames	Small tot-lot does not compare with a large park to serve	So noted.

		high rise housing	
30.	Larry Ames	School grounds are not controlled by the City and therefore should not be counted.	The Greenprint Update follows the current General Plan policy of 3.5 acres per 1,000 population of which a minimum is 1.5 acres of neighborhood/community serving and up to 2.0 acres of recreational school grounds. This General Plan policy is not proposed to be updated as part of the Greenprint Update.
31.	Larry Ames	Greenprint omits connection, through a bridge, from Los Gatos Creek Trail to Willow and Confluence Point to River Street	The bridge is identified in the Los Gatos Creek Master Plan.
32.	Larry Ames	Study the gap from Meridian to Lincoln on the Los Gatos Creek Trail	Please see Note # 27.
33.	Larry Ames	Convert the rail lines into a trail as envisioned in the original Greenprint (Willow Glen Spur Trail)	Staff concurs that an east-west connection from the Guadalupe to the Coyote Trail System in this area of the City is important to the trail network. The Greenprint Update indicates that we will continue to study alternatives and strive for this connection.
34.	Larry Ames	Change the language in the policy that says trails should be “established” on abandoned railroad rights-of-way instead of “evaluate” the trail alignments	The City does not plan to turn every abandon railroad segment into a trail. therefore the City will need to evaluate such abandonment to see if its aligns with the City’s Trail System
35.	Larry Ames	Would like a policy that states the City will follow County and Caltrans trails standards	This requires a policy change in the General Plan, however, the City does use the County and Caltrans standards for Class One Trails.
36.	Larry Ames	Add the word “trails” to the policy regarding constructing and designing accessible parks	The word “trails” will be added for consideration by the General Plan Task Force.
37.	Larry Ames	There will be a need for village-squares and town plazas connected by pathways that make the villages walkable	So noted as a General Plan issue.
38.	Jerry Krinock	Could not find any mention of the word “lawns” in the document and the expense to maintain them.	This is a maintenance issue and the City is currently downsizing its turf inventory to reduce maintenance costs.
39.	Pat Pizzo	Count school acreage only when there is a joint-use agreement in place and public access is clearly outlined (days and times).	So noted. The City only counts the outdoors recreational amenities of K-8 operating sites as public school and high schools where the City has a joint-use agreement in place.
40.	Pat Pizzo	Count only the amenities at a school not the entire school including buildings.	The City only counts the outdoor recreation amenities and not the school buildings, parking lots , and general landscaping. Please see Note # 30.
41.	Pat Pizzo	How is liability dealt with especially with a joint-use agreement with a school?	The City is only liable when a joint-use agreement is in place, then the liable responsibility is defined in the individual joint-use agreements.
42.	Pat Pizzo	GRP as a grand park is a great idea but FAA issues will limit the use of the area.	So noted and the statement is true.
43.	Pat Pizzo	Convenient parking access will also be needed for the Grand Park.	So noted.

44.	Pat Pizzo	Need a facility for large weddings (1,200) that will generate revenue. It has to be a nice facility, with photo-op landscaping and indoor/outdoor capabilities. Consider using one of the community centers.	So noted.
45.	Jack Nadeau	Give highest priority to include the Willow Glen Spur/Three Creeks Trail alignment in the final Greenprint.	Staff concurs that an east-west connection from the Guadalupe to the Coyote trail system in this area of the City is important to the trail network. The Greenprint Update indicates that we will continue to study alternatives and strive for this connection.
46.	Carol Ashman	Don't draw imaginary boundaries that "assumes" they will only be served by a specific area.	These are not physical boundaries and staff understands people will cross such boundaries to meet their recreation needs.
47.	Carol Ashman	Lives in underserved area (AR-6) and City advocates enhancing existing parks instead of building "pocket parks", but why is there a plan to build two "pocket parks" to the north.	Fleming is a pocket park where the Council accepted the land dedication by the developer and the park at San Antonio was another Council action to require the land dedication.
48.	Carol Ashman	An aquatic facility for Evergreen is listed in the plan but has no priority.	It will be prioritized in the final document.
49.	Carol Ashman	The Pleasant Hills Golf Course is a possible resource for the community (for a park, swimming pool, sports field or a community center)	So noted.
50.	Carol Ashman	The Riparian Corridor Policy is not mentioned in the document.	The Riparian Corridor Policy is administered by the Planning Department and our park and trail designs must be in compliance when the policy applies.
51.	Susan Price	The Burbank/DelMonte SNI area is divided between two sections, the Willow Glen Planning area and the Central Planning area thus preventing the focusing on the needs of an area identified as blighted and neglected by the City in 2000.	So noted. Per the Burbank/Del Monte SNI Improvement Plan, this area is deficient in park acres.
52.	Susan Price	How were the numbers in the circles indicating underserved households without park access determined? In the southwest corner of the Central/Downtown planning area map area the number of 24 underserved households east of Leigh and west of Bascom and south of San Carlos is a mystery to me.	The numbers in the circles represent the number of households not being served by any recreation lands.
53.	Susan Price	Does a small park of less than a half acre count the same as a larger park in term of park space within a 1/3 of a mile?	Yes it does.
54.	Susan Price	Do not include school grounds as park acreage. School grounds are not available from 8:00 AM until 3:00 PM during school hours. In the Central Planning Area, the fields of Lincoln High School in SJUSD are often not	Please see Note # 30.

		available after school because they are used by the school's after school sports teams (ask D.A. Ray Mendoza of the Burbank Weed-N-Seed who unsuccessfully tried to arrange for use of some of the sports fields after school at Lincoln High School for use of at-risk kids at Luther Burbank School (K-8), which is across Olive Street from Lincoln High but not in the same school district (Burbank is its own one-school district). In the Willow Glen Planning Area there are NO joint use agreements between the City and the Campbell Union School District nor the Campbell Union High School District.	
55.	Susan Price	The Burbank area includes the largest residential county pocket in the City. Sometime in the future, perhaps within 5 years, that pocket will become annexed into the City. The County pocket contains many families living in poverty. The buildings are old apartments, quadruplexes, often several detached dwellings per small lot. Were these households included in the count? THEY MUST BE INCLUDED.	Yes, they were.
56.	John Urban	Why can't there be 5.0 acres per 1,000 persons within 1/2 mile walking distance of the center of the proposed Villages in San Jose's Envision 2040?	This is a General Plan discussion item.
57.	John Urban	Why not place the 5 acres of open space per 1,000 people between the higher density development and the existing housing stock?	So noted. This is a General Plan discussion item.
58.	Susan Price	Don't count the Sherman Oaks Community Center as a public community center because the programs there are only open to monolingual speakers of that organization's membership.	It is a Reuse site and we have counted the other Reuse sites in the City. This site may eventually convert back to the school district and when it does the acreage numbers will be removed from the inventory.
59.	Alberta Brierly	Wants to increase fees to people who use the parks.	There is no charge for pedestrian access to parks in general.
60.	Alberta Brierly	Wants to see new park purchases delayed until the economy turns around.	So noted.
61.	Alberta Brierly	Does not approve of increases in parcel taxes or new bond measures.	So noted.
62.	Alberta Brierly	Likes the idea of a non-profit parks foundation.	So noted.
63.	Martin Delson	Literally dozens of the projects identified in the Greenprint "as needed in 2000" were marked "Not completed due to unavailable funds". This leads me to question what good it is to identify a project in the	Our funds are restricted on how to spend them. Since 2002, the City has not had the opportunity to spend citywide discretionary money on capital projects.

		Update if it is likely that it will not be implemented for lack of funds? Will we find the same thing happening in the year 2020 as happened with the plans for year 2000; namely, when we get to the end of the planning horizon will we find that a great number of very worthwhile projects have to be marked as “Not completed due to unavailable funds”? How can we ensure that this won’t happen?	
64.	Martin Delson	<p>I don’t recall seeing one very important aspect of park maintenance mentioned. There are homeless encampments along many of the parks along waterways. Perhaps once a year the city has a sweep to clear out and clean up these encampments -- I was involved as a volunteer in a couple of these actions. But after just a couple of weeks the problem returns. I think it is next to hopeless to try to keep the homeless from living in these areas – in any event, the city and county don’t have the resources to do so. I think the city should recognize the situation and do the following:</p> <p>The City should designate some areas (e.g. those immediately adjacent to, or very visible from creek-side trails) as high-priority for clean-up, and have frequent clean-ups there to more actively discourage people from setting up encampments</p>	This is a law enforcement issue that the Department can support in the clean-ups. However, the lead on this is the Police Department and/or the City Manager’s Office.
65.	Martin Delson	For other areas where people live, provide garbage bins and sanitary facilities for the use of the homeless, and empty these facilities frequently enough that trash and waste doesn’t accumulate.	PRNS does not have the resources to provide such services regarding the homeless.
66.	Martin Delson	Page 13 has a table that shows that the current “Current Service Level” for the category “Neighborhood/Community Serving Parkland (City owned)” is 1.6 acres/1,000 population, and the “Service Level Objective” is 1.5 acres/1,000; i.e. <u>less than now</u> . This is surely a step in the wrong direction! Classifying school lands as “parkland” is a misclassification. The per-person acreage of city owned neighborhood-serving parkland should rise, not be allowed to fall.	The 1.5 ratio was noted in the 1994 General Plan entitled “Focus for the Future 2020.” Any change to this number is a General Plan policy issue.
67.	Martin Delson	Page 22, Item 1 says, “The City’s capital investment should align with the ‘Elements of the Greenprint’ chart, the Community Sports Field Study, the Green Vision,	The Department agrees that the trail system development priorities should align with the bicycle network investment priorities whenever possible.

		the Aquatics Master Plan, the Community Center Reuse Strategy, the Urban Environmental Accords and others...” The San Jose Bike Plan should be included in the list of plans that capital investment should align with.	
68.	Martin Delson	Page 22, Item 4 says, “The City should continue its service level objective of providing 3.5 acres/1,000 population of neighborhood/community serving and school recreation parkland based on the parameters outlined in Chapter 5.” The target should distinguish between city-owned parks and school lands, and should identify a specific target for each. School lands should not be classified together with parklands, and their use will be frequently restricted for the public. It would be a substantial improvement if the city would aim to have a level of 3.5 acres/1,000 population <u>without counting schoolyards</u> .	Please see Note #30. The City and other agencies recreational lands provides 1.6 acres/1000 population and school sites provide 1.4 acres/1000 population as noted in the chart on page 13. A list of school sites counted toward the 3.5 acres/1000 population objective will be added to the Appendix
69.	Martin Delson	Page 23, Item 15 says, “Abandoned railroad rights-of-way should be evaluated for acquisition and development as trails when funding, functionality and public safety result from the built trail and where the right-of-way aligns with the City’s Trail System.” This is too tentative. When the criteria are met, the right of way should not be merely “evaluated for acquisition and development”; it should be <u>acquired and developed</u> as a trail!	So noted and please see Note # 34.
70.	Martin Delson	On page 27 it says, “Low, very low and extremely low income units that are restricted for 30 years or more are currently exempt from the PDO/PIO requirements.” I wonder about the wisdom of that policy. I understand the rationale, but on the other hand, it is frequently the areas with low income residents that are in most in need of neighborhood recreational facilities. These facilities should be <u>very</u> local – within hailing distance of residents. Mothers should be able to walk there with their children and, when older, children should be able to go there on their own, walking or by bike, without being driven. Facilities that are two or three miles away should not count towards satisfying this requirement.	This is a Council policy that is currently being discussed.
71.	Martin Delson	Page 33 item 2 says “Define the nexus for community serving facilities.” This heading should be reworded to	The collection of park fees are to be used only for the purpose of developing new or rehabilitating existing neighborhood or

		avoid the legalistic jargon (“nexus”).	community parks or recreation facilities to serve the residential development paying the fees - is our definition of the word “nexus”.
72.	Martin Delson	Page 33 item 6. I would certainly support a general obligation bond to fund the acquisition of parklands and trail routes. The development of these facilities can wait – the important thing is to acquire them before they are no longer available. The longer we wait, the more expensive the land will be.	Thank you, so noted.
73.	Martin Delson	Page 36 item 10 says “Aggressively pursue state and federal grants.” In addition to these sources, city staff should be asked to pursue grants from (or working agreements with) non-profits (such as the Peninsula Open Space Trust or the Greenbelt Alliance) and quasi-governmental agencies (such as the VTA and Santa Clara Valley Water District.)	Thank you, so noted.
74.	Martin Delson	With respect to the subject of Neighborhood/Community Parks (pg. 41), there is a conflict between playgrounds and dogs that should be resolved. Even though dog owners are required to (a) keep the dogs on leash and (b) pick up after their dogs, both of these requirements are too frequently ignored. Having dog excrement in areas where toddlers crawl and small children run about is disgusting. The solution is to forbid dogs to be taken inside any fenced area where there is play equipment. (An example of this incompatibility of use is the small Hummingbird Park on Bird Avenue.)	The City will consider this problem in its new design of future play areas
75.	Martin Delson	On page 46 a discussion of the Trails Network starts. One very frustrating aspect of the current network are the gaps in the network, sometimes very short: e.g. the gap under Highway 237 between the Coyote Creek Trail and the Bay Trail. Similarly, the on-street gaps in the Highway 87 Bikeway are very annoying. And the gap in the Los Gatos Creek Trail between Meridian Avenue and Lincoln Avenue is a tragedy. Spanning this gap should be given the highest priority. If an on-street alignment is unavoidable, it must be one that avoids high traffic roads like Lincoln Ave. and Willow Street.	The current Trail Master Plan for the section of the Los Gatos Creek from Meridian to Lincoln is defined as a street alignment. However, as part of the final Greenprint Update, staff will recommend adding language in the text of the Willow Glen Planning area recommending future study of potential alignments that avoid major vehicle thoroughfares.
76.	Martin Delson	Page 71, “New Park Priority Areas”, item 2: A	So noted, it will be removed.

		maintenance yard should not be listed as an “amenity”.	
77.	Martin Delson	<p>Page 89: Regarding trails in the Alviso Planning Area, two improvements should be added to the list for eventual implementation:</p> <p>a) Filling the gaps in the Highway 237 bikeway (either north or south of the highway) so there is a <u>continuous</u> off-road trail connecting the Guadalupe River Trail (and points further west) with the Coyote Creek Trail.</p> <p>b) An off-road connection should be provided under (or over) Highway 237 to link the Coyote Creek Trail with the Bay Trail going north.</p>	<p>So noted and please see Note # 24 regarding the Trail Master Plan for Highway 237.</p> <p>The connection of the Coyote Creek Trail to the Bay Trail is still being study for a feasible connection.</p>
78.	Martin Delson	Page 96, the map of the Cambrian Planning Area should show the pedestrian bridge across Hwy 85 at Russo.	None of the maps show pedestrian bridges, due to the scale of the maps. Pease see the individual Trail Master Plans
79.	Martin Delson	Page 102, the map of the Central/Downtown Planning Area might show the Los Gatos Creek Trail as completed between Auzerais and San Carlos.	So noted and we will make the correction on the map. The trail is completed between the two streets.
80.	Martin Delson	Page 102, the map shows an ellipse in the lower right corner with the notation, “Study area for most feasible east-west connection”. If it turns out to be impractical to build a trail entirely along the right of way of the Willow Glen Spur of the UPRR, <u>it is essential that the alternative be a genuine off-street trail</u> . A mere bike lane (e.g. along Alma or along San Jose Avenue) is <u>absolutely no substitute</u> for this vital link between two north-south river trail systems.	Staff concurs that an east-west connection from the Guadalupe to the Coyote trail system in this area of the City is important to the trail network. The Greenprint Update indicates that we will continue to study alternatives and strive for this connection.
81.	Martin Delson	Page 104: Planners should recognize that there are plans for a very significant increase in the population in the area bounded by 280 on the south, San Carlos on the north, the SP tracks on the east, and Race Street on the west. This is currently underserved, and will become substantially more so in the future if development plans are realized. The Guadalupe Park was suggested as offsetting the required acreage, but this suggestion should be <u>rejected</u> . The Park it is much too far away to be conveniently accessible (especially since the city and VTA are discouraging automobile use among residents by not providing sufficient parking.) It is essential that	<p>The Burban/Del Monte SNI improvement plan calls for the development of Del Monte Park at the corner of Auzerias and Sunol which will be the main park to serve this area.</p> <p>The dedication of land by developer is specified in the City Park Impact Ordinance (Chapter 14.25 SJMC) and the Parkland Dedication Ordinance (Chapter 19.38 SJMC) at ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 new residents from the proposed housing project. The 3.5 number is the City’s General Plan service level objectives for neighborhood and community serving parklands including recreational school grounds.</p>

		adequate <u>local</u> parkland and recreational facilities be provided for the expected increased population in this area. Since the city cannot acquire the land, it must be incumbent upon the developers to provide public park space at the city's specified ratio of 3.5 acres per 1,000 residents.	
82.	Martin Delson	Page 145, Trails: as I stated in my comments regarding page 46, the gap in the Los Gatos Creek Trail between Meridian Avenue and Lincoln Avenue is a tragedy. If it weren't for this gap of less than a mile, we would have a continuous trail from close to the top of Mt. Umanum down a hiking trail to Lexington Reservoir, and then down a level path all the way to the Bay at Alviso. <u>Spanning this gap should be given the highest priority.</u> If an on-street alignment is unavoidable, it must be one that avoids high traffic roads like Lincoln Ave. and Willow Street; for example, on Glen Eyrie on the south side of the creek, or on Avis, Northrup, and Pedro on the north side, or on a combination of the two, perhaps with a pedestrian bridge across the creek at Cherry.	Please see response to #75. .
83.	Greenbelt Alliance	Greenbelt Alliance supports the vision put forth by Envision San Jose 2040 Task Force Co-chairs Shirley Lewis and Sam Liccardo that describes the Guadalupe River Park and Gardens as the backbone to a network of trails and parks. This model of an interconnected system that reaches out to all corners of San Jose would set the City apart from other large cities. Critical pieces of this network, especially east-west trail linkages, must be prioritized. Additionally, neighborhoods that are currently park deficient should have nearby points of entry into this park and trail system.	The Greenprint is based under the 2020 Focus of the Future General Plan approved in 1994 and its environmental clearance. The 2000 Greenprint is a 20 year plan to the year 2020. The Updated Greenprint will also be under the 2020 Focus of the Future General Plan and its environmental clearance. Not all part deficient areas are adjacent to the City's proposed trail routes. The Envision San Jose 2040 Task Force Plan is scheduled to go to Council in early 2011. Once a new General Plan is adopted by the City, any new policies would be reflects in next update of the Greenprint.
84.	Greenbelt Alliance	Residents and visitors alike can take advantage of San Jose's flat terrain and endless sunny days. As gaps in the system are filled, commuters will view cycling to work as a healthier and more sustainable alternative to the car. The trail system should also link villages, libraries and retail districts. Investing in this vision can have a ripple effect by reducing vehicle miles traveled and thereby greenhouse gas emissions.	This is a General Plan discussion as to how the City will address walkability issues in the future as part of Envision San Jose 2040 Task Force Plan and therefore reduce vehicle trips within San José The City's Trail Network is defined as off-street corridors. Walkable paths along streets falls to the Department of Transportation (DOT).
85.	Greenbelt Alliance	San Jose has been designed and built for the automobile.	Comments, so noted. Will be forward to 2040 General Plan

		The Update of the Greenprint as well as the General Plan should signal a change away from this unsustainable land use pattern. Instead, San Jose should be a city where people walk past storefronts, ride their bikes to school, lounge on street benches, get to know their neighbors, plant herbs and vegetables and soak in the sun.	Task Force.
86.	Greenbelt Alliance	The 2000 Greenprint identified the Willow Glen Spur as an important East-West connector. The Update of the Greenprint has down-graded this linear park and off-road trail to an on-road bike lane. Greenbelt Alliance believes strongly that the trail alignment on the east side must honor the original Greenprint vision. Plans are only great if they are implemented according to the community's input and vision. By falling down on this important detail of trail connectivity, the City is not only missing out on the larger vision of parks and trails, but also in honoring the Mayor's Green Vision.	Staff concurs that an east-west connection from the Guadalupe to the Coyote trail system in this area of the City is important to the trail network. The Greenprint Update indicates that we will continue to study alternatives and strive for this connection.
87.	Greenbelt Alliance	Proposed General Plan Parks Policy PR-3.3 states the following: Apply resources to meet parks, recreation and open space needs in underserved areas of the City. 51 residential areas throughout the City have been indentified as not having access to a park, school or open space within 1/3 of a mile. The Greenprint, and thereby Envision 2040, should prioritize these 51 areas further by ensuring that lower income and higher density neighborhoods benefit first from new parks and better connectivity to the trail network.	So noted.
88.	Greenbelt Alliance	Additionally, community gardens should be prioritized for lower income and high density neighborhoods.	So noted.
89.	Greenbelt Alliance	One of the questions posed to the Envision San Jose 2040 Task Force for the August 24 th meeting was: Given the scarcity of vacant land and large development sites, how should we meet the parks, recreation and open space needs of residents living in and adjacent to the Villages? Here is an opportunity for both some creative thinking and copying of ideas from other cities. San Jose has a plethora of surface parking. City leaders must ask themselves and residents what is more important: plenty of parking options or quality park space.	This is a General Plan issue.

90.	Greenbelt Alliance	Greenbelt Alliance shares the concern of many General Plan Task Force and community members that counting school playgrounds towards the City-wide goal of 3.5 acres per 1000 residents is inadequate. This is especially concerning if school acreage is being counted in the absence of a joint use agreement. While this is one creative approach in providing additional park space for San Jose residents, the uncertainty of whether or not changing school administrations will allow continued use of their facilities must be factored in. Residents deserve permanent park space as the city grows. San Jose must seek additional parks and trails to meet current and future demand.	This is in part a General Plan issue. So noted and please see Note # 30 above.
91.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	A lack of commitment to developing smaller park sites in existing areas that cannot expect future large parcels of land to be set aside for recreation. We challenge the idea that large parks are more cost efficient when taking into consideration residential density. The Buena Vista Park, for instance, at 6,000 square feet in size, serves a greater proportion of residents within walking distance than, Willow Street Frank Bramhall Park in the Willow Glen area. More people per square mile live within walking distance to Buena Vista, so while it may cost more per square foot to maintain, when you break it down by access, the cost per person within walking distance is less. The economic statements throughout the document indicate a lack of commitment to providing services to areas that have done without for decades.	The City's goal is to provide large park sites to serve neighborhoods. If such sites are not available and improving access to nearby parks is not feasible, then the City would look at acquiring small sites of half-acre or larger to fulfill the underserved area.
92.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Focusing on enhancing existing large parks (i.e. Guadalupe River Parks and Gardens) when these sites do not currently serve residents due to proximity problems. If our residents are currently not using existing sites because it's too difficult to get there, how will they be served by enhancing these sites? Furthermore, how would one expect successful passage of future bonds when it would not mean putting such an opportunity closer to each residence?	There needs to be a balance between spending money in regional and neighborhood parks.
93.	Burbank/Del	While there are numerous references to creating "grand	Through the City adopting the Urban Environmental Accords

	Monte SNI	recreation parks” there are few references to creating a recreational opportunity for everyone within a reasonable walking distance. Economic development is reliant upon attainable services. While people may love to visit Millennium Park while in Chicago for other reasons, they do not choose to vacation there just to visit the site nor do they move there because of the site. Economic development relies on access in all neighborhoods.	the City is striving to provide recreation lands within a 1/3 of a mile to residents. It is staffs understanding that Millennium Park is drawing visitors to Chicago to visit the park.
94.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Reliance upon private facilities (i.e. YMCA, gyms), schools or sites that do not serve the local population to bolster public sites. Private sites are subject to market fluctuations and membership; neither serves low income residents well. Schools are off limits to adults during school hours, after school and other programmed times are severely restricted. We do support joint and encourage joint use agreements. Sites such as the Sherman Oaks Community Center should not be considered part of the inventory until the programming allows access and service to the community. This would also give a clearer picture of unserved neighborhoods.	The City of New York and San Francisco have a history of relying on private lands though privately owned and maintained public open spaces as POPOS. The acronym “POPOS” stands for privately-owned public open spaces - publicly accessible spaces owned and maintained by a land owner . POPOS come in many forms: plazas, roof gardens, greenhouses, atriums and others which are open for public use during daylight hours. Through agreements the City should use POPOS to expand recreational opportunities in the future . The City does not count private health clubs like the YMCA, when deterring underserved areas.
95.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	The Planning Area concept divides our community and places us in the outer reaches of two separate Planning Areas. While strategically this shows areas of service and “access” to service within each zone, the reality is, being on the periphery of two zones is misleading. We may be in a zone with “services” but we still are not close enough to access them.	Please see Note #46 and #51.
96.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Trails should be considered transportation routes and the build out and maintenance should be shared with the Department of Transportation. This would allow exploration of different revenue streams and reduce the amount of money spent on a transportation network when it should be supporting strictly recreational areas. This is an excellent time to take advantage of such a change and would differentiate between communities that have trails listed as their sole source of parkland. Trails are necessary and wonderful components, but	DOT provides on-street bike routes and PRNS provides off-street bike and pedestrian routes for recreational purposes. Walking is the number one recreational active in the State of California.

		they are not the same as playgrounds, parks or community gardens.	
97.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We hope that the Greenprint also delivers a message that unless housing developers commit to the maximum on site requirements for public and private open space, our existing and future parkland will suffer. Lack of onsite facilities and amenities means a higher impact on public parks. Also, we hope that future development will be built with a consideration that this is a park deficient community. Future development need to be more “community centric.” Too often, developments are still considered as stand-alone construction projects (especially infill housing) rather how they interact with existing infrastructure and open space.	The Quimby Act limits what the City can request from developers in the way of land dedication, which is based on the PDO/PIO formula of 3.0 acres/1,000 new residents PRNS only provides input on the design of the park and not on the design of the development. The Planning Department provides input on the design of the development.
98.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Page 1 states “...Finally, and most significantly, dwindling City resources are impacting the planning, delivery, operation and maintenance of parks, trails and recreation facilities...” as a determining factor in how we as a City should be looking forward. The statement implies that we will continue with a “business as usual” method that does not imply, encourage or plan for another method of moving forward. We would hope that current economic times, current setbacks or current conditions are the impetus for positive change in the future, not used as an excuse for cutting back, reducing or eliminating plans, projects and policies. Our goal should be to change our model of how we can deliver services, not reduce services to match lowered expectations.	Due to revenue shortfalls in both capital and operating funds, the City is considering delaying projects in order to within its funding means. The Department has presented to the Council some options for Department augmentation of funding which the Council did not approve because of poor polling numbers. Any augmentation of funding will require a public vote per Proposition 218.
99.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Page 4 clearly states our need for a grand vision, but we should also be clearly stating our need for the “small miracles”. All areas cannot take advantage of grand visions, but they can all benefit from filling in the nooks and crannies with public space opportunity. Ignoring this aspect is disregarding the affect on existing neighborhoods which will bear a disproportionate share of new infill development. By only concentrating on the grand vision, by not stating just as clearly our need for smaller places, we are not spreading the benefit of a	The 2040 Envision General Plan Update Task Force is in the process of defining what the “Grand Vision” for the City is, regarding major park amenities. At the community meetings staff heard the desires to pick the low hanging fruits of enhancing the PG&E right-of-ways as park amenities. If funding is available within the Planning Areas then such areas could be enhanced to create such amenities

		<p>parks and recreation policy over the entire city and are making existing underserved neighborhoods suffer continued inequities. We would request the inclusion of a stated intent in the document to ensure parity in this area. We realize it is easier to create grand visions when you have large amounts of space as your canvas, but we cannot make it harder for future generations by not acknowledging this and planning accordingly.</p>	
100.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	<p>Page 7 notes that data was gathered within council districts that do not match planning districts and states that efforts were taken to balance this in a final analysis. We would like to know how this was done as the area we represent was subsequently broken down into multiple planning areas. Breaking our area, which is severely deficient in amenities, into two different planning areas is distortive because it takes a severe problem, felt over a large area, and pushes it into other areas. It balances our problems with amenities in a planning area even if we can't truly access them. A prime example of how this affects us is the conflict in maintaining existing facilities before building new ones. If we could, in fact enjoy the use of our "existing" community center or any other center, there would have been no need to build a new one. Our community has participated in a number of ongoing plans as part of a district. While we do not argue with the idea of planning areas, we do need to point out that placing us outside that format places us at the edges of planning areas and continues to marginalize our needs and opportunities. We are no closer to access than before.</p>	<p>It is unfortunate that these Planning Areas divided the Burbank/Del Monte SNI area, however the underserved areas are still underserved. In the analysis of ranking the Planning Areas, they both are identified as having a "high" park need.</p> <p>The new Bascom Community Center, which will open in 2010, will serve the Burbank/Del Monte SNI area.</p>
101.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	<p>Page 9 again refers to grand plans and opportunities for enhancing major destination sites. We would again ask for inclusion of the "small miracles" concept to balance the picture.</p>	<p>Please see Note #91 and #99.</p>
102.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	<p>Page 20 cites public/private partnerships and refers to private development of sites. Continuing on, we read about creation of a tax exempt foundation to assist in fiscal sustainability. We would hope that an additional section be listed that addresses the public/private partnerships that should and could be created at neighborhood level. Too often good ideas are ignored</p>	<p>Both San Francisco and New York have a model regarding privately-owned and privately maintained open space that are open for public use which the City should consider as an alternative to public ownership regarding small plazas and parks related to new development.</p> <p>The City does have an Adopt-A-Park and an Adopt-A-Trail</p>

		<p>or passed over because “we haven’t done it that way” or “it’s not my job to develop that program”. Each site should be developed or enhanced to encourage local ownership recognizing that each site is unique. Residents should be encouraged to develop local programs to care for sites or provide assistance. There is little current opportunity for this to happen outside of city wide litter and graffiti programs. The Heritage Rose Garden at Guadalupe River Parks and Gardens is a prime example of community driven process. The Municipal Rose Garden is a recent example. But, parks and trails cannot be adopted if the simple step of creating a tool storage area, accessible by the community, can’t be taken. The current recommendations for pricing of community center and library facilities charges the very communities that are trying to volunteer their time and services.</p>	<p>Program.</p> <p>By going to larger centers that have multiple activities could permit the City to waive the charges for volunteer groups for using public spaces.</p>
103.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We fully support the existing goals regarding the targets of service.	So noted.
104.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We have concerns about the change in radius of target areas. Our area could see a reduction, not increase in planned park/open space because we are now broken down into two planning areas. By assigning PDO/PIO funds outside a strict radius and using them within a planning area we have the potential to lose our ability to control fund allocation in a manner that would best benefit the existing (as well as future) residents. How can we ensure that the local planning efforts that take years to develop through something like the NAC (which is overseen by City and Redevelopment staff) are not ignored by future council members or commissions?	<p>PDO/PIO funds are restricted to nexus requirements. By increasing the radius the residents that paid the fees would still need to be served.</p> <p>Staff cannot control what future Councils will recommend or approve.</p>
105.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	As an area with few options we are concerned that our desire (and decades of planning and promises) to create new, small neighborhood amenities isn’t instead overruled by a regional need to develop a trail connection?	The number one recreation activity in the State is walking and the City has determined that trails have a community benefit in meeting this community activity. Please see Note # 91.
106.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We would suggest adding the words “off street” be added to goal #11. Development of trails and bike connections are best done in a manner that doesn’t compete with vehicle traffic.	So noted and will add such wording to page 23.

107.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We would suggest that building a trail is required of a developer (#13) rather than suggested, even if it can't be immediately or in the foreseeable future connected. If we wait for all pieces to be ready, if we don't take advantage of each opportunity when it comes up, trails would never be connected. Even if the site isn't used as a connection to a trail, it can be used by residents. In addition, maximum riparian setbacks should be required whether or not the water continues or disappears into a culvert under the street. This will allow the City to slowly take back the access while slowly repairing native habitat.	Per the State Subdivision Map Act it requires a proposed project of 200 units or more to be able to condition the development of a trail. The Riparian Corridor Policy is administered by the Planning Department and enforced by the City Council.
108.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Item #10 suggests some control over school facilities. We are concerned that this is a faulty assumption. Even if the school site is available via a joint use agreement at this point in time, there is no guarantee that the facility will be open years from now. While we encourage joint use agreements and would hope that the City becomes proficient in developing these agreements, this recommendation implies control over property owned by another entity. Unless there is some type of permanent attachment to control of the site, there is little means of making this a sustainable or equitable condition to development.	The Urban Environmental Accords states that access to a recreation lands be within a 1/3 of a mile but it does not define recreational lands. Therefore the current General Plan allows the City to count playgrounds, hardscape play areas and open turf areas as recreation lands.
109.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Goal #28 should emphasize serving residents, not attracting tourists. The previously sited "grand plan" sites in the document (Millennium Park and Central Park) were not designed as tourist sites; they were designed to serve residents. The economic development that follows these projects, while substantial, is a secondary benefit.	So noted.
110.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	While we agree that partnership with the Redevelopment Agency is key to providing services to SNI areas (#30), the City, through PRNS has an obligation to compensate for previous lack of implementation and/or development in the area. We are concerned that this implies too much emphasis on RDA to even the service for these communities when this agency is already addressing other things such as community capacity and neighborhood building, economic development, streets/sidewalk development,	Most of the capital funding has restrictions on its use and therefore it cannot be used in built-out areas of the City which may include some of the SNI areas.

		etc. Perhaps this could be simply folded into the agencies listed in #22.	
111.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	#31 of the vision/goals suggests a private facility could be counted in inventory of available services. We are unclear on what this statement implies and would like clarification.	Both San Francisco and New York have a model regarding privately-owned and privately maintained open space that are open for public use which the City should consider as an alternative to public ownership regarding small plazas and parks related to new development. In order to provide these spaces the City could provide PDO/PIO credits through parkland agreements to encourage development of such facilities.
112.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	#32 states continuation of a 3-tiered system but does not address current issues with community centers that do not fit into any of these tiers. For this reason we feel a category that defines these few sites should be included. A facility that does not meet the criteria of any of the tiers, a facility that effectively operates as a private entity should not be inventoried or counted as an asset for the community at large.	Reuse sites are considered as Neighborhood Centers.
113.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We strongly believe that an additional element should be added that moves forward the concept of smaller plazas, parks and sites that can be added to the urban core area since there are few opportunities for these areas to benefit from expansion or development of the large regional sites.	When there are no alternatives, these sites will be evaluated on a case by case basis. Please see Note # 91.
114.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We continue to have concerns that the entire outreach process was developed around council districts then broken out into planning areas. While it is too late to go back and gather data around the planning area format, it is obvious that splitting areas like ours in a random manner does not serve our needs. We also have concerns surrounding the inclusion of school sites as they are not controlled in any manner by the City of San Jose. They should be considered in the same manner as private facilities such as the YMCA. Based on the community survey, the conclusion is drawn that maintaining services is more important than preventing local tax increases, but the survey was conducted in a manner that didn't give an option. The question "Is maintaining services so important to you that you are willing to help pay for them" could have provided a different response. Likewise, the questions regarding upgrade of the larger facilities such as Kelley Park were	<p>What we heard at the community meetings was what they liked and disliked about parks, recreation facilities and programs in their community and also citywide. This information was very transferable between Planning Areas and Council Districts.</p> <p>Reliable quantitative telephone survey instruments, which represent a broad and diverse population, are most effective when they offer respondents clear, easy to understand questions with appropriate and balanced response options. The aggregated responses to the issues of importance provide a simple assessment of where residents priorities lie. The more specific questions get the need for respondents to anchor the question with specific costs and benefits that were not willing to define at this point in the research process.</p>

		not posed in a manner that stated “If you agree to this you are also agreeing to losing the opportunity to develop smaller parcels”.	
115.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We hope that future surveys ask a very important question that ties visiting parks, recreation centers, libraries and trails to proximity. It is important to note the degree of use compared to access in order to plan in a manner that helps ensure some degree of equity. The existence of many underserved areas is noted, but the responses aren’t broken down to reflect use in relation to access. This is also an important factor when noting residents who use school sites rather than sites owned or operated by the City. If 21% of people use school sites, do they represent 21% of the population across the board or do they represent a higher number of people who only have access to a school site? Likewise, this survey does not break down people who cannot use a school site and may not have other options. For example senior citizens who have no local community center, library or park would have a different experience than a family with school aged children. It wouldn’t matter to the seniors if the facility was locked after hours or not.	<p>The telephone survey was used to gather information from across the City and the responders noted they were willing to drive up to 10 minutes to a recreation facility. Staff has determined that a 10-minute drive translates into approximately 3 miles.</p> <p>The 21% of households (not necessarily individuals) that use school sites as their primary outdoor recreational area in the City in the last 12 months. So another way of interpreting the response to Q10 (Which outdoor recreational area does your household primarily use in San Jose (rephrased not verbatim Q10))</p> <p>64.6% = Parks</p> <p>17.8% = Recreational School Grounds</p> <p>17.6% = have not used an outdoor recreational area in San Jose in the last 12 months or did not provide an answer to the question.</p>
116.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Analysis of online survey results should be noted not as a statistical whole number that represents the entire city, but should be noted as a statistical sampling of those with internet or computer access. Areas such as ours, with a high population that does not have computer or internet access are quite likely to have different needs and are also the least likely to be able to access some services.	The City used multiple methods of gathering feedback from residents, through workshops, telephone surveys and online surveys. The online survey was open to all residents and could have been completed from public or private computers. The telephone survey used a sophisticated sampling and data weighting methodology to ensure that it was representative of San Jose’s resident adult population .
117.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	While breaking out the responses by district (i.e. D6 wants graffiti and litter programs), how does this correlate to planning areas?	District 6 is made up of half of the western Central/Downtown and all of the Willow Glen Planning Area.
118.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We are thrilled that the City is looking towards capitalizing on the development of freeway park sites. Re-capturing these sites could provide much needed recreational space along while providing the economic means of paying for them.	So noted.
119.	Burbank/Del	We hope that future conversation around trail	So noted.

	Monte SNI	development factors in trails as transportation routes and the subsequent value in developing non-auto means of moving across town.	
120.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	The analysis of people who need/want dog parks doesn't break out those who don't feel the need for dog parks because they are using the existing parks as off or on-leash areas illegally. While the data shows "availability" of space not owned, operated or under the control of the City of San Jose, there is no course of action outlined regarding how this information might be made useful or how the City plans on implementing an action plan to use these sites. For instance, if the City has a plan to develop joint use agreements with 50% of the school sites for use of the pools or playing fields, such a goal should be outlined. Otherwise, the data is interesting, but shows no ability to be folded into the needs of the City to provide services. This would be like a homeowner marketing their house for sale by pointing out that 3 neighbors on the block own pools; great information, but not anything that adds value to the property in question.	Currently dogs are allowed on City parks as long as they are on a leash. (Note: Check previous General Plans as to when did we start counting school sites)
121.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Did the study include the unincorporated County areas?	Yes, we counted everything within the City limits.
122.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Breaking our area into two planning districts dilutes the deficiencies for us.	It is unfortunate that the Burbank/Del Monte SNI Area is divided into two Planning Areas, however the underserved areas are still underserved. In the analysis of ranking the Planning Areas, the Central Downtown and the Willow Glen Planning Areas are identified as having a "high" park need.
123.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	The Fire Training Center site is in one planning area, but the NAC has taken a position that if that site is not available in the future then services should be concentrated on the other side of the NAC.	So noted.
124.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	Knowing that most of the Midtown area has already been approved for high density housing, why did we not take that into consideration when "crunching the numbers"?	Staff did take this into consideration in crunching the numbers.
125.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	While a 1/3 mile criterion was used to determine access, it is not clear whether that is "as the crow flies" or how far it would take to actually get there on foot, in a wheelchair, etc.	The analysis was done based on as the crow flies, taking into consideration major barriers such as freeways, creeks, waterways or major streets.

126.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	We would again request Sherman Oaks Community Center be re-classified as a private amenity due to the fact is it not accessible by the community nor is programming designed to serve our residents.	Sherman Oaks is a public facility and is a Reuse site. Public access to this facility is provided in the late afternoon and in the evenings.
127.	Burbank/Del Monte SNI	This appendix mis-states the priorities of the Burbank/Del Monte NAC in the approved plan, in revisions made through the last 8 years of input and planning or in the pending Revised Action Agenda (RAAP). Specifically our community has prioritized among other things the expansion of Del Monte, retaining Murray’s Bar site for future park, completing an economic (not environmental) study for a freeway platform, enhancing onsite amenities at the Bascom Community Center and Library and expansion of the Buena Vista Park all before any funds or consideration for the Tillman Park site. The matrix does not indicate this and is mis-leading.	The list was coordinated with SNI staff.
128.	District 8 Roundtable	The Greenprint Update should incorporate clearer guidelines concerning the concept of <u>interconnectedness</u> among the various components of the proposed plan. The Greenprint relies on an analysis of 12 Urban Planning Areas, in which each area is assessed in terms of whether it serves the needs of the specific population. This is important, but it is equally valuable to have an assessment of needs across planning areas, in which the City is knitted together east to west and north to south. Trails should be connected across planning areas, and larger parks should serve several urban planning areas simultaneously.	So noted.
129.	District 8 Roundtable	The Greenprint Update should incorporate clearer guidelines concerning the reliance on <u>school acreage</u> in order to achieve the goal of 3.5 acres/1000 people. The Greenprint allows for up to 2 acres of school lands to be counted in the total 3.5 acreage/1000 goal. Yet, schools do not always allow the public to use their facilities during the daytime. Also, schools don't all have joint use policies with the City of San Jose. It is important to have solid contractual agreements with the 19 school districts and two college districts. School acreage should only be considered if school has a written joint use agreement or Memorandum of Understanding which states the	This issue is being discussed by the General Plan Task Force.

		<p>following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location and type of school - Size of area shared - Amenities available (swings, ballfields etc.) - Days and hours of availability to general public - Maintenance responsibility - Duration of agreement 	
130.	District 8 Roundtable	<p>The Greenprint Update should incorporate clearer guidelines concerning <u>private-public partnerships</u> and the creation of a new Parks Foundation. What are the responsibilities or restrictions inherent in a private-public partnership? How can volunteers, community organizations, school districts, and corporations all contribute to enhancing our parks and recreation system? Without a clear set of guidelines, it will be difficult for the City to create standardized public-private partnerships across the whole City. A template should be developed and vetted with community and City folks. This template should contain the basic guidelines for which the City will accept and evaluate the private-public partnership recommendations and applications.</p>	So noted and please see Note # 94.
131.	District 8 Roundtable	<p>The Greenprint Update should develop clearer guidelines concerning whether parks and recreational facilities respond to actual community needs. This is the <u>functional</u> aspect of parks and recreation that is quite different from the numerical aspect of having a certain number of acres per population density. Some neighborhoods may desire dog parks, while other neighborhoods may desire skateparks. It is important that the City addresses the needs of the community rather than having a one-size-fits-all planning process. It is also important to do a periodic assessment of the actual uses of the parks and recreational facilities to see if they are successful in serving the community's needs. All park development and/or enhancements should be thoroughly vetted with the surrounding community and groups to be sure it meets their needs. Parkland dedication considerations as a result of residential development should be discussed with the surrounding community before decisions are made regarding</p>	All park development or major enhancements are vetted through a public process.

		PIO/PDO dedications.	
132.	District 8 Roundtable	The City's Riparian Corridor Policy should be incorporated into the Greenprint Update with an emphasis on achieving targeted guidelines, and the Greenprint Update should also reaffirm the City's commitment to preserving riparian habitat in its relation to planned trails and parks.	The Riparian Corridor Policy is administered by the Planning Department and enforced by the City Council. In the construction of trails and parks, the City should comply with the policy, unless a greater need for a trail to cross over a creek is warrant in its alignment.
133.	District 8 Roundtable	In terms of the Evergreen Planning Area, we make the following recommendations: This planning area should extend far enough south to include all developed areas, including the Cal Oak Creek neighborhood.	The Planning Area is defined by the Planning Department and the City Council.
134.	District 8 Roundtable	The area south of the Villages is deficient in neighborhood parks and this is a community need.	It's noted in the document.
135.	District 8 Roundtable	It is important to underscore the need to provide a Meadowfair Community Center, because this area of Evergreen is underserved in terms of community centers.	So noted.
136.	District 8 Roundtable	All considerations for spending the \$1.8M in park facility renovations should be thoroughly vetted with the multiple community groups to ensure equity and fairness.	In the development of the Capital Improvement Program, the community may comment on the proposed projects as the Council approves projects each year.
137.	District 8 Roundtable	Although the area around the Pleasant Hills Golf Course is included in the Alum Rock Planning Area rather than the Evergreen Planning Area, many of these residents prefer to travel south to enjoy Evergreen's parks and recreational facilities rather than traveling north into the Alum Rock area. Therefore, it is important to consider the needs of "border dwellers" in the planning areas, who may prefer to enjoy the parks and recreational facilities of a different planning area.	So noted.
138.	County of Santa Clara	Page 23, Number 14, "the City would comply with all resource agency permits to ensure that trail development occurs in an environmentally sensitive manner." In addition to permit compliance, the City would need to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for trail development projects.	In order to construct a project, the City needs to comply with resource agency permits and CEQA.
139.	County of Santa Clara	Page 24, Number 23, "the City should continue collaborating with the County and other appropriate jurisdictions to direct the expenditure of regional park	Please see Note # 105 for walking activity. Not all of the capital funds are available to be used in the expansion of the trail network. If the nexus is recognized, then park Trust Funds

		funds to provide parks and other open space lands and recreation resources within, or in close proximity, to the urban population.” It should be clarified whether regional trails could be included as part of the City’s regional park funds.	could be used for the development of trails as a community asset.
140.	County of Santa Clara	Page 24, Number 26, “the City encourages the County and other public agencies to accept dedications of open space lands of regional significance, including watersheds, wildlife habitats, wetlands, historic sites and scenic lands.” It should be clarified whether citywide trails of regional significance could be included.	Please see Note # 139. The County is on record of providing a major segment of the Coyote Creek Trail within the City limits of San José.
141.	County of Santa Clara	Page 36, “develop a Parks and Community Foundation,” as one of its strategies. The role and relationship of the new Parks and Community Foundation should be clarified in relation to the existing parks foundations, such as the Emma Prusch Farm Park Foundation and others. In addition, it is unclear whether this new Parks and Community Foundation would have a major role in overseeing the new revolving loan fund that would allow for purchase of land, when it is available, since the foundation has been identified for fundraising efforts for the generation of the revolving fund.	If the revolving funds are an asset of the Foundation then the answer is yes, if not then no.
142.	County of Santa Clara	Page 38, “future acquisitions of hillside open space lands should fall to the County Parks and Recreation Department, the County Open Space Authority, the Santa Clara Valley Water District and/or the State of California.” Other land acquisition partners could include the Nature Conservancy, Peninsula Open Space Trust and other land trust agencies. It should also be noted that acquisition of hillside open space lands should be consistent with the respective agencies’ vision and mission in the provision of parks, trails, recreation and open space. Furthermore, with local partnerships involved in the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (such as the County, Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, Santa Clara Valley Water District, City of San Jose and others), future acquisition of hillside open space lands within the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) project area would need to fulfill the acquisition criteria for the HCP Reserve System. Finally this statement should not	So noted.

		preclude the City’s role and partnership opportunities with implementing the regional trails that connect to the hillside open space lands, which include: Bay Area Ridge Trail (El Sombroso/Penitencia), Silver Valley Connecting Loop Trail, Silver Creek Connecting Loop, and South Metcalf Trail.	
143.	County of Santa Clara	Page 39, “publicize the relative cost value of using City facilities such as fitness centers compared to private athletic clubs.” As part of this comparison the City should consider the beneficial value of using the City’s outdoor recreational facilities such as trails, par courses, sports fields, tennis courts, basketball courts and other playgrounds when compared with the costs of private athletic clubs. These valuable outdoor recreational facilities contribute to the health and well-being of the community that should be measured and documented.	Such a study is currently not funded by the City Council.
144.	County of Santa Clara	Page 39, “development of a campaign to support specific measures would require private leadership and funding.” It should also be noted that a funding measure campaign program would benefit from partnerships with the community, such as volunteers, docents, neighborhood groups, Friends of groups, and non-profit organizations. This support function could be considered under the role of the new San José Parks and Community Foundation.	So noted.
145.	County of Santa Clara	Page 54, “partnerships continue to be developed with school districts and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) for use of open space as community gardens.” The City and the County’s discussions for the future use of Martial Cottle Park, a State-County park, as community gardens should also be noted as one of the emerging partnerships.	Add the County to the community garden discussion on page 54.
146.	County of Santa Clara	Page 56, Open Space (Undeveloped Lands) – In order for the City of San José to meet the General Plan requirement for 7.5 acres per 1,000 population of citywide/regional parkland, the City partners with the County Parks Department and Santa Clara County Open Space Authority to provide regional parks and open space since the City is only able to sustain 1,000 acres of open space lands, or 1.0 acres per 1,000 population based on 2007 population numbers. With the new	When the City includes other jurisdiction lands, in the year 2020 there will be a surplus of over 8,000 acres of citywide/regional parkland (see page 14). For a population of 1,148,000 in 2020. Need to check number of acres in regards to proposed changes to the document

		Census data that will be released, where it is estimated that the City of San José would have approximately one million residents, the Draft 2009 Greenprint does not explain how the City’s additional open space and regional parks requirements would be met in 2020.	
147.	County of Santa Clara	Page 58, Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation – Calero County Park and Coyote Creek Parkway County Park should be included along with Penitencia Creek, Hellyer and the future Martial Cottle Park, as valley floor parks within the City of San José’s sphere of influence.	So noted and the change will be made on page 58.
148.	County of Santa Clara	Page 65, “to address the underserved areas, a recommended strategy is wherever possible enhancing and expanding connections to existing parks and/or construct additional amenities within them to allow more users. This strategy is preferred to acquiring separate smaller parcels to construct pocket parks which will only serve a limited number of residents.” This strategy highlights the importance of the citywide and regional trails system to provide access for underserved neighborhoods to existing parks, open space and trails system. Therefore, additional strategies for expanding partnerships with other agencies and public-private partnerships in the development of a continuous trails system for these neighborhoods should be considered.	So noted regarding additional partnerships in developing a continuous trail system. Also, please see Note # 91.
149.	County of Santa Clara	Page 70 City of San Jose Planning Areas – Consider modifying the symbology for the City Council districts so that the districts are legible in a black and white print-out of the map.	For easy viewing the maps are printed in color.
150.	County of Santa Clara	Page 71 New Park Priority Areas – “Acquire property within the Coyote Urban Reserve for land banking purposes to support district-wide amenities (could accommodate sports complexes, maintenance yard, large dog park, swim center and a community center).” It should be noted that the future acquisition and development of the Bay Area Ridge Trail and Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail connection within the Coyote Urban Reserve should be included as part of the district-wide trail amenities.	So noted and changes will be made to page 71.
151.	County of Santa Clara	Page 74 Almaden Planning Area – The Santa Clara	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page

	Clara	County Countywide Trails Master Plan Update (“Countywide Trails Master Plan”) identifies the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail’s Northern Bicycle Retracement Route (R1-A bike) along the Guadalupe Creek Trail (Route S3) within this Planning Area. In addition, the Countywide Trails Master Plan identifies the West Valley Sub-regional Trail (Route S6) as a priority within this Planning Area which has not been included as a “proposed trail” or “countywide trail” designation.	79
152.	County of Santa Clara	Page 79 Capital Action Plan for Almaden Planning Area – There should be priority consideration or development strategy for the proposed Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail’s Northern Bicycle Retracement Route (R1-A bike) along the Guadalupe Creek Trail (Route S3) and the West Valley Sub-regional Trail (Route S6) even if they are not funded priorities.	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 79
153.	County of Santa Clara	Page 80 Alum Rock Planning Area – It should be noted that the Bay Area Ridge Trail route also serves as the countywide trail route Coyote Creek/Llagas Creek Trail which is a sub-regional trail (Route S5) that ultimately connects to the Coyote Creek Parkchain.	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 85
154.	County of Santa Clara	Page 85 Capital Action Plan for Alum Rock Planning Area – There should be priority consideration or a development strategy for the proposed Bay Area Ridge Trail / Coyote Creek/Llagas Creek Trail that will connect to the Lower Silver Creek Trail and Coyote Creek Parkchain even if they are not funded priorities.	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 85
155.	County of Santa Clara	Page 90 Berryessa Planning Area – It should be noted that the Coyote Creek Trail route also serves as the countywide trail route Coyote Creek/Llagas Creek Trail which is a subregional trail (Route S5) that ultimately connects to the Coyote Creek Parkchain.	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 95
156.	County of Santa Clara	Page 96 Cambrian/Pioneer Planning Area – It should be noted that the Guadalupe River Trail also serves as the countywide trail route S3, and that the Guadalupe Creek Trail also serves as the countywide trail routes Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail’s Northern Bicycle Retracement Route (R1-A bike) and countywide sub-regional trail route S3.	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 101

157.	County of Santa Clara	<p>Page 102 Central/Downtown Planning Area – It should be noted that the Coyote Creek Trail route also serves as the Bay Area Ridge Trail (Route S5-C) and countywide trail route Coyote Creek/Llagas Creek Trail which is a sub-regional trail (Route S5) that ultimately connects to the Coyote Creek Parkchain. In addition, the Guadalupe River Trail also serves as the countywide sub-regional trail route S3.</p>	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 109
158.	County of Santa Clara	<p>Page 111 Edenvale Planning Area – It should be noted that the official park name “Future Martial Cottle County Park” should be “Future Martial Cottle Park,” which is the name designated in the property transfer agreement and deed restrictions. In 2008 the Board of Supervisors accepted the Martial Cottle Park Master Plan’s goals and objectives for a future trail connection from Martial Cottle Park to the City’s trails system, using the general route of Chynoweth Avenue. The Draft Greenprint should prioritize a future trail feasibility and/or development study for this potential trail connection from Martial Cottle Park to the Guadalupe River Trail. The Countywide Trails Master Plan also identifies the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail’s Northern Bicycle Retracement Route (R1-A bike) along Santa Teresa Boulevard which should be included as part of the City’s priorities, even if it is unfunded at this time. The Guadalupe River Trail also serves as the countywide sub-regional trail route S3.</p>	<p>So noted for the name and will be corrected in the adopted final copy</p> <p>As for the trail alignment, the City is considering a trail along the Canoas Creek to link Martial Cottle Park to the Highway 87 Bikeway.</p> <p>The City will include its proposed alignment into its prioritization process for the development of trail sections</p>
159.	County of Santa Clara	<p>Page 117 Evergreen Planning Area – It should be noted that Thompson Creek Trail also serves as the Silver Creek Loop Trail which is connector trail route C22 in the Countywide Trails Master Plan. In addition, Fowler Creek Trail also serves as the Silver Valley Trail which is a connector trail route C21 in the Countywide Trails Master Plan.</p>	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 121
160.	County of Santa Clara	<p>Page 122 North San Jose Planning Area – It should be noted that the Hetch Hetchy Trail also serves as the countywide connector trail route C4, the Guadalupe River Trail as countywide sub-regional trail route S3 and the Coyote Creek Trail as countywide subregional</p>	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 127

		trail route S5 in the Countywide Trails Master Plan.	
161.	County of Santa Clara	Page 129 South San Jose Planning Area – It should be noted that the Guadalupe River Trail also serves as the countywide sub-regional trail route S3.	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 133
162.	County of Santa Clara	Page 140 Willow Glen Planning Area – It should be noted that the Guadalupe River Trail also serves as the countywide sub-regional trail route S3 and Los Gatos Creek Trail also serves as the countywide sub-regional trail route S4.	Add to Citywide discussion on page 71 and Action Plan on page 145
163.	County of Santa Clara	Since the Parkland Inventory includes potential parks, would it be possible to include potential citywide/regional trails projects in the inventory?	The potential park sites are identified in the inventory which the City has either zoned the property for park development and/or the developer has entered into a turnkey agreement to convey the property.
164.	Kathryn Mathewson	There is no one responsible for keeping track of the open space on school grounds and school open space keeps disappearing without any community input or controls. There is no information in the Greenprint or the Park Department’s as to how much open space comes from schools versus actual parks and no information about what schools have open space contracts with the City. This appears to be a secret and needs to be public knowledge and publically available.	The City and other agencies recreational lands provides 1.6 acres/1000 population and school sites provide 1.4 acres/1000 population as noted in the chart on page 13. A list of school sites counted toward the 3.5 acres/1000 population objective will be added to the Appendix
165.	Kathryn Mathewson	The Greenprint recommendations are for 2 acres/1000 of open space can come from schools. However, when there are no school open space Master Plans, when my neighborhood schools (Trace, Hoover, and Lincoln) have lost approximately 75 percent of its open spaces in the past 15 years, when schools close, when newly remodeled fields are locked, when school open spaces cannot be used by the public during school hours, when schools suddenly decide to not have an open space agreement with the City and legally do not need to, and when there is no way to keep school open spaces forever publically “open”, it is not a good idea to attach the future of permanent open spaces to schools.	Please see # 30 above for school response. A list of school sites counted toward the 3.5 acres/1000 population objective will be added to the Appendix
166.	Kathryn Mathewson	There is no public document for the city’s required 3.5 acres/1000 parks requirement and no details. This must be a requirement of the Greenprint. The facts regarding park deficits by district should be available to the public on the city’s website.	The City’s General Plan is its blueprint for future development including parks, trails and recreational amenities. The City’s current General Plan is the 2020 Focus for the Future Plan, which identifies the service level objective of 3.5 acres/1,000. Once the Updated Greenprint is adopted by City Council, this

			information will also be provided on a Council District level. Please note that the boundaries of Council Districts will change in 2012 to reflect the 2010 U.S. Census.
167.	Kathryn Mathewson	Park deficit areas like District 6 have reduced park equity but you would never know that we lack parks by reading the Greenprint. With current city policies and growth, this park deficit will only grow. The Greenprint is not addressing the important issues of getting more land for parks. Instead, it addresses things like working with community centers and this does not address our city's major problem now and in the future.	Most of District 6 is divided into the western park of the Central/Downtown Planning Area and most of the Willow Glen Planning Area. In the Central/Downtown Planning Area on page 104 it calls for an additional 323.3 acres of neighborhood/community serving parkland to meet the 3.5 acres per 1,000 population. In the Willow Glen Planning Area on page 141 it calls for 100.3 acres of neighborhood/community serving parkland to meet the service level objective of 3.5 acres per 1,000 population.
168.	Kathryn Mathewson	The parks department must be more aggressive in working with the City of San Jose to save public open space land wherever it is even if it is adjacent to the city boundaries in another city or county land. In the BAREC 17 acre state owned land bordering San Jose adjacent to a neighborhood with no park for more than a mile away the City Council voted to help save BAREC but did nothing. Today, BAREC's 17 acres remains available. Also, the 160 acre Fairgrounds must be addressed as an important public open space asset. The Greenprint must address this issue.	So noted.
169.	Kathryn Mathewson	There are many ways to obtain more public land and to pay for it. Few are addressed in the Greenprint. In #10 below I have listed many of them followed by some books on the subject. There should be at least one full time staff person to work on this issue. Foundation money could pay for this position.	Thank you for information and suggestion regarding a full-time staff person allocated toward park acquisitions.
170.	Kathryn Mathewson	With regards to health and education, missing are close to home natural areas for children to learn and have creative play experiences and grow healthy food and not just equipment based tot lots. Read "Last Child in the Woods: Saving our Children from Nature Deficit Disorder" by Richard Louv on this.	A fair part of the City is all built out and there is very limited access to natural areas. The creeks that do run through the City, the Permitting Agencies have indicated they would prefer no human contact with the water.
171.	Kathryn Mathewson	Missing are large open spaces which are what the Accords call "Habitat Corridors". They include shelter, food-bearing plants, and natives and not just trails with bikes rushing by. This does not mean creek trails. However, it would be wise to attach some large open	The Accords state to "Pass legislation that protects critical habitat corridors and other key habitat characteristics (e.g. water features, food-bearing plants, shelter for wildlife, use of native species, etc.) from unsustainable development."

		spaces to creek corridors for birds, insects, butterflies, etc. Since Guadalupe River Park cannot have large trees, plants that attract birds, or birds, this park cannot be included in this kind of thinking (requirements as per its owner, the Federal Administration or FAA).	
172.	Kathryn Mathewson	The process by which you are creating this 2009 Greenprint Plan is not community oriented. You should first be talking to the community and then developing the plan. Instead, you are writing it, setting a deadline for comments, and then having community meetings. How can you possibly be meeting community needs with this process?	Community input included two community meetings per District, written surveys and a 1,000 person telephone survey. The two latter community meetings so stated allows the community to make changes to the draft document. This closes the community input process before submitting the document to public hearings.
173.	Kathryn Mathewson	You have not addressed or had a discussion on the qualities of what a “Grand Park” should be. Instead, the Greenprint decides to have a Grand Park at the Guadalupe River Park without addressing its major limitations such as: Flyway and thus noise and air pollution and soot (airport buildings would be black if they were not cleaned twice a week); the Federal Aviation Administration owns the Guadalupe Park land. They have a lot of restrictions placed on this land like short trees (a limited palette which they list) and plants with no fruit to attract birds. These issues limit many of the events that can be placed on this land. Outdoor concerts and botanical gardens would not happen here. A grand park should not have these limitations. I have attached a list of what a Grand Park should include.	We consider all the regional parks as major park facilities. The discussion of the “Grand Park” is being discussed at the General Plan Update meetings. However, there is discussion of a “Grand Park” in the document on page 44.
174.	Kathryn Mathewson	You have not addressed the importance of healthy soil to sequester carbon and thus help San Jose become carbon neutral. Are you testing our soils for its healthy biology (in one handful of healthy soil there are more alive organisms than people in the world)? Are you removing old agricultural pesticides in our parks and community buildings so people will not get such problems as cancer? Also, such soil will reduce water needs by 50 to 75 percent.	When developing new parks, the City obtains either a phase I or phase II soil clearance from Environmental Services Department (ESD). If required, the soil will be mitigated per ESD’s direction for public contact with the soil.
175.	Kathryn Mathewson	San Jose currently has a ratio of parks to people that is not meeting the city’s standards (3.5 acres/1000 residents). Also, it is not meeting the standards put forth by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA). They recommend a ratio of 6 to 10 acres/1000	NRPA has moved from those standards or providing acres per population to instead allowing each individual entity to determine their own needs based their individual communities. The City’s 2020 General Plan calls for 3.5 acres per 1,000 population of which a minimum is 1.5 acres of

		residents of “Close to Home” park space and a ratio of 15.2 acres/1000 for “Regional Space”.	neighborhood/community serving and up to 2.0 acres of school recreation grounds. Per the State’s Quimby, the State has set the minimum level at 3.0 acres of neighborhood and community parks per 1,000 population.
176.	Kathryn Mathewson	Decisions about the future of San Jose’s park system and the Greenprint need to be done with full knowledge about the urban parks research and excellent case studies around the country. I feel this is missing in the current Greenprint process. Therefore, I am providing some of this kind of information to you.	Thank you for this information. Forward to General Plan Task Force.
177.	Kathryn Mathewson	<p>There are many different ways to purchase park land which San Jose is not discussing. Following are some of them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Public-private partnerships b. Clean-up superfund sites creating new bio-remediation businesses which are needed all over the country. c. Trades of land (both private and public open space). State law requires that they must first offer land to local governments at reduced prices. Given the need for more public land, no public land should be sold to the private sector. The Trust for Public Land has a national organization to stop this. Work with the communities to ensure that such large parcels as the Fairgrounds is not sold to developers. d. Lease public land to obtain funds to purchase as was done at San Francisco’s Yerba Buena Gardens. e. Bonds/Initiatives (most everyone will vote for parks). f. Trusts (like the Trust for Public Land or family trusts) and Foundations. g. Neighborhoods and individuals taking responsibility for parks. h. Theme and cultural parks paid for by interested parties. i. Collect funds from developers to purchase future large parcels of land. The developer small pocket parks are not supplying all the open space needs of the population increase they are creating. 	<p>Thank you for the information.</p> <p>The City has and is looking at doing more public-private partnerships.</p> <p>The City has traded lands for parks</p> <p>Kelley Park was a gift to the City.</p>
178.	Kathryn	I have attached a list of the Ahwahanee Smart Growth	Thank you for the information.

	Mathewson	<p>Principles for urban open space. We are not following many of them. Following are some of the important ones which need to be addressed in looking at the future of our park system:</p> <p>a. The community should have an ample supply of specialized open spaces; density is balanced by grand open space (farmland, forest, parks, and riparian corridors) that remain unbuilt and that provide access to nature for residents;</p> <p>b. The natural terrain, drainage, and vegetation of the community should be preserved with superior examples in the parks and greenbelts;</p> <p>c. Encourage the development of local character and community identity and preservation of history.</p>	<p>The City's Greenline Policy helps to protect the surrounding hillsides from development.</p> <p>The City's Riparian Policy also help to protect creeks within San José</p> <p>OSA, Midpeninsula Open Space District, the County and State Parks are the main agencies in providing access to natural lands</p> <p>PRNS is considered as a municipal parks and recreation department within an urban environment</p>
179.	Kathryn Mathewson	San Jose Grand Park Qualities and Possible Event and Spaces (handout)	Thank you for the information.
180.	Jean Dresden and Helen Chapman	They recommend that the City not count school acreage since schools are outside of City control.	See # 30 for school discussion. The State under the Naylor Act considers recreational grounds associated with K-8 schools as public recreational asset to a community. The City counts these lands as a recreational asset to the City, as we now do with other public agencies' recreational lands.
181.	Jean Dresden and Helen Chapman	Does installing a new bench or tot lot in a neighborhood address that neighborhood's needs and is now "served"?	No, our goal is to provide access to various community recreation facilities within a 3 mile radius and neighborhood facilities within ¾ mile which a bench or play area may provide a recreation benefit to a neighborhood.
181.	Jean Dresden and Helen Chapman	Maintain the 3.5 acres per 1,000 population but do not count schools	The General Plan allows the City to count recreation school grounds. Please see Note # 30. This issue is being considered by the Envision 2040 General Plan Task Force for Council approval in 2011.
182	Greater Gardner SNI NAC	Retain the 3.5 acres of parkland/1000 resident standard and the location of community serving parkland within a 1/3 mile from all residents	So noted for the acres per 1000 ratio, however, City implementation of the Urban Environmental Accords calls for a park or recreational lands within the 1/3 mile and not just a community park. The City goal is to have community elements of parks within a 3 mile driving distance.
183	Greater Gardner SNI NAC	Count only school grounds if a long term joint-use agreement is in place for use of that school site	Currently the City counts 1334.2 acres at of K-8 recreational school grounds at 165 sites and only high school grounds with

			joint use agreements. Under your proposal the acres would drop by 1,220 acres unless the City has an agreements with school sites. The ratio would drop to 1.7 acres per 1,000 residents. The City would have to fund recreational improvements on school property in order to enter into an agreement. The agreement would normally expire in 20 years.
184	Greater Gardner SNI NAC	Regarding the 1/3 mile standard under the Urban Environmental Accords use as walking distance and not a radius and stop at any arterial streets, expressways, freeways and railroad tracks that are obstructing the walking path.	So noted
185	Bruce Tichinin for Save Our Trails	Keep the proposed alignment for the Three Creeks Trail, (aka Willow Glen Spur Trail) on the discontinued Union Pacific Railroad Corridor – a East-West Connection is key in providing access to various facilities named in letter	Please see Note # 33
186	Bruce Tichinin for Save Our Trails	Use the “Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines” for a “High Volume/Urban Experience” Trail (Level 3)	Please see Note # 35
187	Rachel Santos OSA	Please change the OSA acreage number to 2,500 acres on page 56 of the draft.	Staff will make this change
188	Rachel Santos OSA	Change out wording on page 58 regarding OSA to read: The Santa Clara County Open Space Authority serves a portion of the County which does not lie within the boundaries of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District. The goals of OSA includes the preservation of open space and the creation of greenbelts between communities, regarding lands on the valley floor, hillside viewsheds, watersheds, baylands and riparian corridors. OSA has acquired nearly 15,000 acres of open space lands to date. OSA has also assisted with the City’s Trail Program by contributed funding towards projects such as the Penitencia Creek Trail, Albertson Parkway Trails, Willow Glen Spur Trail, Selma Olinder/Coyote Creek Development and Lower Silver Creek Trail.	Staff will make this change
189	Councilmember Sam Liccardo	In the North San Jose Planning Area, designate acreage for near term parkland acquisition and development in the South Rincon Area, commensurate with the City’s commitments in the Rincon South Specific Plan	The map for the North San Jose planning area in the final 2009 Greenprint Update document will be updated to match commitments made for parkland development in the Specific Plan and North San Jose planning processes

190	Councilmember Sam Liccardo	In the Central/Downtown Planning Area: Designate the area on the east side of the Southern Guadalupe Trail, from Interstate 280 to Willow Street, for parkland/open space, in anticipation of a joint use agreement with the Santa Clara Valley Water District	Add the following to the Final Update: “The City should continue to explore partnership opportunities with other agencies that will provide access to recreational and open space for residents of San José. In particular, the City should discuss potential partnering opportunities with the Santa Clara Valley Water District for open space land on the east side of the Guadalupe River from Highway 280 south to Willow Street.”
191	Councilmember Sam Liccardo	In the Central/Downtown Planning Area: A long term plan to convert the Union Pacific Railroad line to trail, from Highway 101 to the Guadalupe River Trail	Staff is proposing to keep the language as it is shown in the draft Update. Staff realizes the importance of evaluating each and every right-of-way for its potential benefits to the City’s trail and transportation network and will continue to place a priority on these opportunities. However, Staff does not believe the language should mandate any study or evaluation of every abandoned railroad right-of-ways. This could hamper the City’s flexibility and create administrative burden and unintentional consequences.