

From: [Hill, Shannon](#)
To: [Downtown West Project](#)
Subject: FW: Utilidor and GHGs
Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 12:58:48 AM

From: Keyon, David
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 9:21 AM
To: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>; Benabente, Julie <Julie.Benabente@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Re: Utilidor and GHGs

Hi Shannon,

I will have to attend to putting out fires for today's Council meeting today, so will not be able to look into anything Downtown West until tomorrow. Sorry.

Thanks,

David Keyon

Principal Planner, Environmental Review
City of San Jose
(408) 535-7898 david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov

From: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 9:19 AM
To: Benabente, Julie <Julie.Benabente@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Utilidor and GHGs

David, since you have been the reviewer for Air Quality and GHGs, could you please review my summary below and provide direction on how this issue should be addressed?

Julie,

I'm assuming you are still looking for an answer to this question. Sorry I dropped the ball after my initial response. GHG estimates are based on the modeling in the Air Quality section of the EIR. I checked both the Air Quality and GHG sections, and there is no analysis of Air Quality emissions with and without the utilidor option.

Based on this, I'm assuming your question is only regarding the claim in the AB 900 application, correct?

I can relay direction to ESA as necessary.

Thanks!

Shannon Hill, Planner

Planning, Building & Code Enforcement | Environmental Review Section

City of San José | 200 East Santa Clara Street

Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov

From: Benabente, Julie

Sent: Friday, May 22, 2020 1:51 PM

To: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Re: 5/26 Comments Due

No, my question is really "can they truthfully claim that district systems would mean a net GHG reduction in emissions vs. connecting to existing City infrastructure (e.g. wastewater or recycled water)"? Our department did not see evidence that this claim could be made. Still, I don't know that that's such a huge deal, I could just make the suggestions that they say "Based on AB900 application calculations.." then make the claim, for accuracy. It's something that our Director honed in on at one point so want to make sure it's noted.

From: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>

Sent: Friday, May 22, 2020 1:41 PM

To: Benabente, Julie <Julie.Benabente@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Re: 5/26 Comments Due

Hi Julie,

GHGs would need to be analyzed for both scenarios if it's unclear whether or not district systems would be implemented as part of the project. Does that answer your question? The applicant could not claim reductions if district systems would not be part of the project.

Best,

Shannon Hill, Planner

Planning, Building & Code Enforcement | Environmental Review Section

City of San José | 200 East Santa Clara Street

Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov | (408) 535 - 7872

From: Benabente, Julie <Julie.Benabente@sanjoseca.gov>

Sent: Friday, May 22, 2020 12:19 PM

To: Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>; Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Re: 5/26 Comments Due

Hi David and Shannon,

I wanted to get a little bit more information from you on CEQA since it's not something that I typically deal with. My understanding is that the CEQA GHG portion just measures compliance of the project to a certain threshold. But if the project is stating that they are reducing GHG emissions with district Systems versus if they didn't use district Systems I don't think that's something that CEQA is evaluating or making a finding on, is that correct?

I think that the ab900 application does make that sort of finding. But it's also based on whatever calculation method is used in that document to make the determination so we still want to see if we have any questions around that before we would get behind the statement.

-Julie

On May 22, 2020, at 11:02 AM, Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov> wrote:

Hello City Team,

Thank you for your participation in yesterday's meeting with the applicant. If you have additional comments and questions, please update the Excel spreadsheet for the Infrastructure Plan and Sustainability Chapter for the DWDSG by 4 pm Tuesday, 5/26. I will then send the comments to the applicant, radio silence is a confirmation to send. Please also share this information with additional counterparts that I have missed. If you have any questions or comments please let me know. Otherwise, have a Happy Memorial Weekend.

Thank you,

James Han

Planner | Planning Division | PBCE

City of San José | 200 East Santa Clara Street

Email: james.han@sanjoseca.gov | Phone: (408)-535-7843

For More Information Please Visit: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning>

San José City Hall is closed in response to COVID-19.

I am working remotely in accord with governor's and City's direction.

I will monitor email during this time.