

From: [Severino, Lori](#)
To: [Moody, Doug](#); [Ekern, Bill](#); [Klein, Nanci](#); [Eidlin, Eric](#); [Heyne, Colin](#); [Rood, Timothy](#); [Ruano, Jose](#); [Tu, John](#); [Han, James](#); [Keyon, David](#); [Hill, Shannon](#); [Zenk, Jessica](#); [Mendez, Zacharias](#)
Subject: Fw: Parking & Traffic Assessments in Delmas Park regarding Google and the Diridon Station Area
Date: Thursday, October 31, 2019 10:36:48 AM

Hi team,

See comments from a Delmas Park resident, who I think used to be president of the NA.

I would like to discuss these comments and others that were raised at the meeting on Tuesday at an upcoming meeting (perhaps once the 30-day letter is done!).

To quickly summarize, parking and transportation were top concerns. Residents generally recognized that travel patterns are slowly changing and the goal to move toward other modes is a good one - for making their neighborhood a more pleasant place. But many also want to make sure the City recognizes and plans for the current auto-dependency that exists. One person expressed frustration with the removal of on-street parking on Park to add bike lanes. One resident said that she would like to take light rail but it is much slower than other modes, and Caltrain is really slow on the weekends when she wants to go to SF - leading others to demand better, faster service and more BART to come to DT sooner - if the City expects people to switch over. Several pointed out that cars are more practical and desirable for many low-income people ("cars = freedom" as one person said) - raising equity issues that need consideration. A mom expressed frustration at the thought of not having a car to get her and her 4-year-old around. The same mom was very concerned about how her daughter will succeed in San Jose if she doesn't end up with a good tech job (opportunity and inclusion concerns). There was a lot more about jobs, housing affordability, homelessness, and park maintenance...

In looking at the map Doug sent me yesterday, would it be possible to expand the boundary of the parking study to include the entire Delmas Park neighborhood? Like housing and transportation in general, the DSA boundary doesn't mean much...

I think his comments about Adobe and the need to expand the study scope with respect to traffic point out the need for us to do some education and communication about how we do traffic analyses. I addressed several questions about the development and environmental review process at the meeting - including clarification that the EIR will not address traffic and parking, but that these topics are still part of the development review.

Thanks!

Lori

From: Andrew Tubbs [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2019 9:21 PM
To: benavidez@google.com <benavidez@google.com>; Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Sarah Springer <president@delmaspark.com>
Subject: Parking & Traffic Assessments in Delmas Park regarding Google and the Diridon Station Area

To the Google team, Lori Severino, and the office of San Jose District 3,

First of all, thank you to everyone who was available for last night's (29-Oct) presentation to the Delmas Park Neighborhood Association. As the faces of large entities, your jobs may often be difficult and seem thankless, so I just want to recognize your efforts.

I am concerned that each entity is living up to the strictly explicit requirements of assessing and addressing environmental impacts to the negative effect of overlooking obvious impacts that lay just beyond those requirements. I am in no way dismissing the enormity of those requirements, but, as I and others pointed out last night, parking and motor vehicle traffic have been and will continue to be significant issues here and any study of parking and motor vehicle traffic that only goes so far as the Diridon Station Area's ("DSA") boundaries will only tell an incomplete story.

With regards to parking, the Delmas Park neighborhood is (as Mrs. Severino discovered) a hodgepodge of permitted and unpermitted parking areas that covers commercial and single- and multi-family residential land uses. The Lakehouse district is covered by the Parkside RPP zone, supported by funding from the SAP Center at no up-front cost to covered residents. Other areas are covered by the Delmas Park RPP zone, which is limited to single-family residences and paid for by residents therein. New multi-family is explicitly excluded from participating in those RPP zones. As such, there is tense competition for space in unpermitted areas between residents and businesses (though, it must be noted, most of the current consumption by the latter is from mechanic and auto body shops).

If we only limited parking and traffic studies to the boundaries of Google or the DSA, that context wouldn't be made fully clear and we'd end up in a situation where my home is included (in the case of the DSA) whereas my neighbor directly across the street would not be. Obviously, the result of any such studies would have glaring holes in the data that would severely restrict what conclusions could be drawn and some conclusions would be technically true within the bounds of the study, but wholly disconnected from reality.

To exemplify that end, I would like to draw your attention to the traffic impact study prepared for Adobe's 4th tower. In that study, because Adobe was working strictly within the bounds of that development (as is according to the law, as I understand it), it studied traffic outcomes as if in a vacuum devoid of other adjacent or nearby development projects. What they did was technically true and the conclusions technically valid, but a parody of reality. That study made no consideration of traffic flows on streets and through intersections as the area builds out, even as that build-out will obviously change those flows. It concluded that a certain number of drivers will exit westerly on to San Fernando Street, but will that hold true after Google builds out the Water Company site and the intersection of San Fernando and Delmas—already a mess in the afternoons—becomes increasingly impassible? Incomplete data yields erroneous results from which meaningful conclusions cannot be derived.

So here's my ask: please, in assessing traffic and parking impact, look toward ways to do so more broadly than the scopes which are required of you.

Tangentially, I want to say that I believe individuals do have agency and, regarding parking, will consider that when looking at jobs or housing. As such, I believe planning goals should be forward-looking rather than myopically assuming the needs of the present moment will be the needs of the future. It does not make sense, nor is it feasible, for Google or the City of San Jose to try to satisfy

every possible need of every individual simultaneously. If we are working toward a future focused on transit and active mobility, we must leave it up to the agency of individuals to opt-in or opt-out over time. Therefore, decreased parking ratios, such as those presented by the Google team, are only as problematic as the context they exist within.

Thank you,

Andrew Tubbs
Resident, Delmas Park

cc: Sarah Springer, DPNA President