

07-14-20

ITEM #3  
RTC# 20-642

**Simrat Dhadli**

---

**From:** Rodney Dunham <rodneypauldunham@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 9:40 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** AGAINST Today's Council Discussion on Extending Republics exclusive agreement

My name is Rod Dunham I'm a 4th Generation Santa Clara and live at 829 Benton Street. I am the founder of Reclaiming Our Downtown. I speak for myself.

The Santa Clara train station is, in my opinion, a more vital transit hub to this community and the South Bay than even The Diridon Station. It is 1/2 mile from San Jose Mineta Airport; the Diridon Station is three miles away. This station could exemplify Transit-oriented development. But the area around MUST be planned to be synergistic to the station and ALL buildings must be laser focused on "commuters."

The City of Santa Clara has given this developer "exclusivity" and, like so many examples in Santa Clara development, the citizens have been left out of the process. Enter the University of Santa Clara. They want to expand their student body by 3000 students and, therefore, they need to expand student housing.

I've looked at this plan. No matter what you name it, the Republic development is for SCU students. Period. These students are NOT going to use the train daily – they are going to walk to school minutes away. Citizens who NEED this type of housing to get to and from work are forced to get back in their cars and fill our streets with additional traffic.

Citizens are screaming from the hoods of their cars to place more housing in taller buildings near transit hubs. They are not advocating more housing for students attending a \$55,000 a year University. The case of 500 Benton Street takes scarce land resources and does nothing to solve our problems. Commuters are forgotten. Planning was done in a vacuum and that vacuum was filled by the economic needs of SCU.

Our Mayors, Councilmembers and Planners must improve housing options for the people who provide vital services to our cities and reduce traffic congestion. The plan needs to be "re-envisioned" not for one powerful school, but for the citizens of the City in which the building is located.

My ask to our Council this Tuesday is to scrap the existing agreement; take inputs from the citizens of their City, and create a competitive arena for developers to deliver to our needs.

Regards,

Rod Dunham

## Simrat Dhadli

---

**From:** Carter Fulhorst <cfulhorst@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 8:16 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Do Not extend the Republic agreement

My name is Carter Fulhorst and I live at 320 Crestview Dive, Santa Clara District 6. I am a member of Reclaiming our Downtown's Core Group but am speaking as a citizen.

This development could be synergistic to the train station. Instead it actually damages it.

This proposal cuts current parking levels to only 94 spaces from 240. Before the pandemic, you could not find a parking space after 9am and we are going to cut it even further? Members of my district have repeatedly complained that CURRENT parking levels need to be expanded. What is the Council's remedy to create additional space if this plan goes through? Where are you going to park?

I also think that Downtown must be considered in this plan. Why wasn't Reclaiming Our Downtown contacted by the developer. Did the developer consult or even reach out to the Downtown Task Force?

Based on this last meeting, citizens are not getting answers from Republic. My opinion is the extension should not be granted and the City Council must look at the entire grid around the station and plan accordingly. We can do this one property at a time if we truly want TOD for this area. Plan for 2085 and not 1985.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carter Fulhorst

Reclaiming Our Downtown Core Member

Reference: Exclusive negotiating agreement (Agenda item 3.)

John Dietrich  
644 Main St  
Santa Clara

Resident since 1980  
Member of South Bay Historical Railroad Society since 1992

First I am disappointed that the City Council holds meetings in the middle of the work day. I don't have the option to watch and interact from my work. I would rather speak directly to the council rather than providing a written submission.

I spoke at the last extension action to have an exclusive negotiating agreement with this builder. I was against having an exclusive agreement with a company that presented such a poor starting point on this project.

I thought the project was dead since I had not heard of any public presentations on the project until last Thursday. I expected more meetings to help develop the project with the community.

The project does look better than the presentation last year but my belief that Republic Metropolitan is NOT a quality partner for the City of Santa Clara has grown stronger because of their attitude with the public.

My reasoning is based on the following:

1. **Hiding from public?** Mr. Mendelsohn, from Republic I discovered later, participated during the on-line meeting without a name or picture identifying who he is and the company he represents. I think if this project is important enough to Republic, Mr. Mendelsohn would be willing to make his comments known as associated with the developer. If he was not prepared for the meeting, then this is stronger evidence that the project is not important to Republic.
2. **No respect for public.** I asked a simple question at the meeting. I wanted to know if the good looking building that Larry Helling, from the water department helped design to match the architecture of the Santa Clara Depot, would move to the well's new location. Mr. Mendelsohn's answer to me was they were moving the facility. I again asked if they were moving the building. He reiterated yes they were moving the facility. Continuing to press, I discovered they were not moving the building due to the fact that it didn't fit the new space, but they are moving all the functionality. I do not appreciate Mr. Mendelsohn's demeaning answer trying to imply yes to my question when the answer is no. This interaction demonstrates Republic's lack of community respect.
3. **Not qualified.** One of Santa Clara's HLC commissioners (acting as a community member not as a commissioner) asked if Republic had performed an impact statement (I probably have the wrong term) for a development next to a historic district. Their

answer was where we can find that document. They acted as if they had no idea what was being talked about. I say this alone is enough to disqualify Republic from working with the City. The City would sever relations immediately with any contractor hired to demolish a building that requested how to find out about asbestos abatement.

4. **Less than optimum talent.** The architect hired to design this project does not have the experience to design this project that is adjacent to a historic district. This has been demonstrated by answers given.
5. **Design not realistic.** The ratio of parking to the number of units may follow some guidelines but the design is not at all realistic. The parking supporting commuters using Caltrain is being cut more than half. A half of a parking space for each bed will never work. I know we can talk about how idealistic this parking ratio should be, but unless we impose regulations like in Japan where you are not allowed to purchase a vehicle unless you can provide a certificate of parking location. **Where are all the extra cars going to park?**

Thank you for your time. Republic Metropolitan **MUST NOT** continue to have an exclusive agreement with the City of Santa Clara for this project. They are not qualified to build near a historic district and they have shown they do not respect the input from the community.

John Dietrich

07-14-20

ITEM #3  
RTZ # 20-642

**Simrat Dhadli**

---

**From:** Seif Mazareeb <seif.mazareeb@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 1:10 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Caltrain Station Development

Dear Mayor and City Council,

my name is Seif Mazareeb, and I reside @ 1393 Santa Clara St, Santa Clara, CA 95050.  
I find it very upsetting that you have been scheduling these meeting at 1:00pm - most of us have jobs and can't make these meetings, and just feel like we are trying to rush something in the dark (or maybe bright daylight when most of us are busy) !!

I also back Jonathan Evans (old quad) and oppose renewing the ENA with Republic Metropolitan for the third time. Re/Met has shown that they are not the appropriate partner to work with the City to develop this publicly owned land.

Instead of a development which benefits all Santa Clara we are getting an expansion of SCU, a private university, onto City owned land. This expansion includes exclusionary private dorm housing, as seen at other university campuses, and a sports medicine clinic for the university.

These do not benefit the community as a whole but instead enrich the developer and a private university.

The dorm style housing is especially egregious as these rentals cost significantly more per square foot than other styles of housing, and per-bed leases discriminate against families. The City requires 15% affordable housing on new developments and should meet that minimum on its own land. The City should not be allowed to "double-count" VTA's affordable component toward its own requirements.

Despite being called the Santa Clara Station, this development has not made allowances for the transit focus of this parcel. They have not adequately studied or planned for parking for Caltrain, they have designed the buildings such that the butt end of the building faces the transit stops. Everything about this design turns its back on transit and Historic Franklin Street.

The developer has not communicated the impact on relocating the well located on this site. No public discussion of the well's broader impact on residents, businesses, and faculty, staff, and student students at nearby schools should something go wrong has occurred.

With regard to the historic train depot, a listed place on the National Register of Historic Places (NHSP), Re/Met has demonstrated they do not have an adequate plan on how they will address this project's impact. They have also not publicly addressed concerns on the impact on the site itself, which lies within the Santa Clara Third Mission area, itself eligible for listing with the NRHP.

The Mayor and City council should vote no on the ENA renewal since this project does not meet the communities needs and Re/Met has shown that they are uninterested in engaging with the community to do so. This site should only be developed after capturing the needs of the whole community, and not only those of a private university.

Overall, this seem to be a hasty decision when most public opinion can't be heard since most of us can't show up due to work, or due to the need for social distancing.

Sincerely,

--

Seif Mazareeb

- \* Any society that would give up a little liberty to gain a little security will deserve neither and lose both. Benjamin Franklin
- \* Not knowing is not a problem, not wanting to know is !
- \* Nothing is so good for an ignorant man as silence; and if he was sensible of this he would not be ignorant. Saadi, 1200-1292
- \* Love all, trust few, do wrong to none.
- \* Once you eliminate your number one problem, number two gets a promotion." G.Weinger
- \* You live more in 5 minutes on this kind of bike than some people do their whole lives. Burt Munro

## **Simrat Dhadli**

---

**From:** Eric Tyson <rikek1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 1:11 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Comment for 7/14/20 1pm Council and Authorities Concurrent Meeting

Hi,

I had technical issues with ecomment and see that my comment wasn't able to post. If possible, I'd appreciate the below comment being read by the clerk during the meeting. Thanks.

**Eric Tyson, Santa Clara resident, District 5**

**It's a great thing that this land is being further developed, and making smart choices for these critical properties will pay off down the road for Santa Clara.**

**The developer is not currently making a smart choice. SCU is an important part of the community but they already have a significant amount of crucially valuable land and the ability to develop it.**

**SCU doesn't need this land as much as the broader population of Santa Clara does. To ignore the value of 500 Benton as a transit-oriented development is a disservice to the broader community.**

7/14/20

Item #3

Julie Minot

---

**From:** Ray Poudrier <raypou@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 1:43 PM  
**To:** Mayor and Council; Public Comment  
**Cc:** contactoqra@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Council and Authorities Concurrent Meeting - 07/14/2020 - Agenda Item 20-642

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I'm a registered voter in Santa Clara District 4.  
I oppose renewing the ENA with Republic Metropolitan. Re/Met has shown that they are not the appropriate partner to work with the City to develop this publicly owned land. They have not yet shown any consideration for working with the residents of the city to properly address community concerns for the project.

There is a lack of affordable housing on the city-owned portion of the project.  
The design itself puts the transit it claims to support as a secondary concern, with no regard to the history of the area.  
The changes to the drinking water supply for residents in the area may have large implications. This should be properly studied and announced.

I understand that we are in a critical need for housing, but I do not see this developer and project moving closer to the goal of affordable housing, especially when it will be leased on a per-bed basis.

Thank you,  
Ray Poudrier

**POST MEETING MATERIAL**

7/14/20

Item. 3

**Simrat Dhadli**

---

**From:** Linda Hylkema <ravens\_eye@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 2:49 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Public Comment for 500 Benton Street Project

Good afternoon.

My name is Linda Hylkema, and I am the Archaeological Advisor to the City of Santa Clara. On the City's website, this project is listed as pending, so it does not appear that any CEQA documents have been posted at this time. That said, I would like to make the point that not only is the 500 Benton Site located within an historically sensitive area, it is WITHIN the Murguia Mission Santa Clara Site. This site is recorded with the State of California as CA-SCL-30H.

Site CA-SCL-30H has within it a dedicated mission cemetery holding the remains of thousands of Native American individuals. As such (and for other reasons) the mission site is automatically Eligible for Inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places. The project will also clearly impact the Santa Clara Railroad Depot, which IS Eligible for Inclusion on the National Register.

Let me also take a moment to highlight the fact that despite there being a parking lot with utilities and other disturbances on the parcel, there will be, based on the findings during projects nearby, areas within the project area that will have intact strata that will contain archaeological material. As one who has overseen literally hundreds of construction projects in Santa Clara over the last thirty years, I have never, ever been on a construction site as large as the one being proposed without there being a significant amount of historical material.

Therefore, the Santa Clara Station Project will require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. A Negative Declaration instead of an EIR will not fulfill the city's requirements for complying with the CEQA process.

Lastly, a General Plan Amendment, as is being proposed here, would also trigger a response to AB 52 – CEQA Tribal Consultation.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Hylkema  
Archaeologist; Archaeological Advisor to the City of Santa Clara

Sunnyvale, CA

**POST MEETING MATERIAL**

## Julie Minot

---

**From:** Kathleen Romano <karomano@me.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 6:27 PM  
**To:** Mayor and Council; Public Comment  
**Subject:** Council and Authorities Concurrent Meeting - 07/14/2020 - Agenda Item 20-642

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I'm a registered voter in Santa Clara District 5. As our district currently does not have proper representation to ensure our community's interests are served, I am writing you all to oppose renewing the ENA with Republic Metropolitan for the third time. Re/Met has shown that they are not the appropriate partner to work with the City to develop this publicly owned land:

- Instead of a development which benefits all Santa Clara we are getting an expansion of SCU, a private university, onto City owned land. This expansion includes exclusionary private dorm housing, as seen at other university campuses, and a sports medicine clinic for the university. These do not benefit the community as a whole but instead enrich the developer and a private university.
- The dorm style housing is especially egregious as these rentals cost significantly more per square foot than other styles of housing, and per-bed leases discriminate against families. The City requires 15% affordable housing on new developments and should meet that minimum on its own land. The City should not be allowed to "double-count" VTA's affordable component toward its own requirements.
- Despite being called the Santa Clara Station, this development has not made allowances for the transit focus of this parcel. They have not adequately studied or planned for parking for Caltrain and have designed the buildings such that the butt end of the building faces the transit stops. This design turns its back on transit, Historic Franklin Street and the holistic approach required to incorporate any station area development, in conjunction with the Downtown Community Task Force, as a gateway to Santa Clara's historic center.
- The developer has not communicated the impact on relocating the well located on this site. No public discussion of the well's broader impact on residents, businesses, and faculty, staff, and student students at nearby schools should something go wrong has occurred.
- With regard to the historic train depot, a listed place on the National Register of Historic Places (NHSP), Re/Met has demonstrated they do not have an adequate plan on how they will address this project's impact, including massing/scale and increased foot traffic to the depot. They have also not publicly addressed concerns on the impact on the site itself, which lies within the Santa Clara Third Mission area, itself eligible for listing with the NRHP.

The Mayor and City council should vote no on the ENA renewal since this project does not meet the community's needs. This site should only be developed after capturing the needs of the whole community, and not only those of a private university.

Sincerely,  
Kathleen Romano  
OQRA Secretary

Historical and Landmarks Commissioner

*The above comments are mine as a Santa Clara resident and in no way represent HLC or the City of Santa Clara*

## Julie Minot

---

**From:** Janet Stevenson <janetmstevenson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 9:42 PM  
**To:** Mayor and Council; Public Comment  
**Subject:** Subject: Council and Authorities Concurrent Meeting - 07/14/2020 - Agenda Item 20-642

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I am a registered voter in Santa Clara District 5. I oppose renewing the ENA with Republic Metropolitan for the third time. Re/Met has shown that they are not the appropriate partner to work with the City to develop this publicly owned land.

Instead of a development which benefits all Santa Clara we are getting an expansion of SCU, a private university, onto City owned land. This expansion includes exclusionary private dorm housing, as seen at other university campuses, and a sports medicine clinic for the university.

These do not benefit the community as a whole but instead enrich the developer and a private university.

The dorm style housing is especially egregious as these rentals cost significantly more per square foot than other styles of housing, and per-bed leases discriminate against families. The City requires 15% affordable housing on new developments and should meet that minimum on its own land. The City should not be allowed to "double-count" VTA's affordable component toward its own requirements.

Despite being called the Santa Clara Station, this development has not made allowances for the transit focus of this parcel. They have not adequately studied or planned for parking for Caltrain, they have designed the buildings such that the butt end of the building faces the transit stops. Everything about this design turns its back on transit and Historic Franklin Street.

The developer has not communicated the impact on relocating the well located on this site. No public discussion of the well's broader impact on residents, businesses, and faculty, staff, and student students at nearby schools should something go wrong has occurred.

With regard to the historic train depot, a listed place on the National Register of Historic Places (NHSP), Re/Met has demonstrated they do not have an adequate plan on how they will address this project's impact. They have also not publicly addressed concerns on the impact on the site itself, which lies within the Santa Clara Third Mission area, itself eligible for listing with the NRHP.

The Mayor and City council should vote no on the ENA renewal since this project does not meet the communities needs and Re/Met has shown that they are uninterested in engaging with the community to do so. This site should only be developed after capturing the needs of the whole community, and not only those of a private university.

Sincerely,

Janet Stevenson

## Julie Minot

---

**From:** Gregory Romano <gjromano@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 10:28 PM  
**To:** Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Council and Authorities Concurrent Meeting - 07/14/2020 - Agenda Item 20-642

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I am emailing the Mayor and the Council directly as it is your responsibility to represent district 5 which has no representation.

I attended the community out reach Zoom last week and it was clear that Re/Met did not have a comprehensive plan for the development at the Caltrain parking site. They glossed over the affordable housing and spent most of the time defending their dorm style housing. This clearly shows that this project's priority is student housing. Something that benefits a private university and not the Santa Clara Community.

I oppose renewing the ENA with Republic Metropolitan for the third time. Re/Met has shown that they are not the appropriate partner to work with the City to develop this publicly owned land.

Instead of a development which benefits all Santa Clara we are getting an expansion of SCU, a private university, onto City owned land. This expansion includes exclusionary private dorm housing, as seen at other university campuses, and a sports medicine clinic for the university.

These do not benefit the community as a whole but instead enrich the developer and a private university.

The dorm style housing is especially egregious as these rentals cost significantly more per square foot than other styles of housing, and per-bed leases discriminate against families. The City requires 15% affordable housing on new developments and should meet that minimum on its own land. The City should not be allowed to "double-count" VTA's affordable component toward its own requirements.

Despite being called the Santa Clara Station, this development has not made allowances for the transit focus of this parcel. They have not adequately studied or planned for parking for Caltrain, they have designed the buildings such that the butt end of the building faces the transit stops. Everything about this design turns its back on transit and Historic Franklin Street.

The developer has not communicated the impact on relocating the well located on this site. No public discussion of the well's broader impact on residents, businesses, and faculty, staff, and student students at nearby schools should something go wrong has occurred.

## Julie Minot

---

**From:** Julie Minot  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 8:53 AM  
**To:** Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** FW: Web Submission Republic Metropolitan vote today  
**Attachments:** image001.png

Best regards,

**Julie Minot, SPHR** | Executive Assistant, Mayor and City Council  
Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara  
1500 Warburton Avenue, Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel: 408-615-2252 | [www.santaclaraca.gov](http://www.santaclaraca.gov)



**City of  
Santa Clara**  
The Center of What's Possible

**From:** Dawn Thompson <dawn.l.thompson2012@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 8:47 AM  
**To:** Julie Minot <JMinot@SantaClaraCA.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Web Submission Republic Metropolitan vote today

Dear City Council,  
Why is it that our City was destroyed 70 years ago (1950's) and has not been rebuilt yet? Over these years many land owners worked their influence and opportunities to control this land and make money under the guise of city taxes. We now have residents who truly care and are interested in the health and well being of our city. Time for our City Council to sit up and listen. Vote NO until further open meetings can be held and approved for the best.

Tim and Dawn Thompson

On Fri, Jul 10, 2020, 11:14 AM Julie Minot <[JMinot@santaclaraca.gov](mailto:JMinot@santaclaraca.gov)> wrote:

Hello Ms. Thompson,

Our office confirms receipt of your correspondence via the City's webpage, which has been forwarded to the full City Council for their review.

Best regards,

## Julie Minot

---

**From:** Donna West <dwestsfo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 8:49 AM  
**To:** Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** contactoqra@gmail.com; Donna West  
**Subject:** Council and Authorities Concurrent Meeting - 07/14/2020 - Agenda Item 20-642

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mayor Gillmor, City Council, and City Staff:  
Thank you for what you are doing for us in these challenging pandemic times.

I am Donna West, 30 year resident and business owner in the City of Santa Clara. I am in District 3,

I'm a small business owner and I can't afford to live here. I could be a first responder, a nurse fighting Covid, a teacher, a police officer. We all have two things in common: 1) up to  $\frac{3}{4}$  (three fourths) of our paycheck goes to housing in the Bay Area and, 2) without us, our economy, our health and way-of-life collapses.

That is why I was excited to attend a meeting for a new building that is planned right next to Santa Clara's train station. If planned correctly, I thought, this could be an ideal location for affordable smaller units for those of us in the San Jose/Santa Clara area who need affordable, smaller units and utilize the train to get to and from where we work.

But this is not what is going to happen. Metropolitan was chosen by the City as the "exclusive" developer. The meeting's goal was to get input, but the developer chose mainly speakers who attended or represented Santa Clara University. Only two citizen's questions were answered.

It became apparent that, instead of the affordable smaller units that this area needs AND citizens want, the University is aiming for, and will be receiving, even more student housing.

Students who would not use the train, but rather walk 100 yards to their classes, would inhabit a building hundreds of feet away from the train station.

This defies logic.

By granting exclusivity to Republic, YOUR citizens are not being heard. I ask that Council reject the extension of this and open this up so we can get a developer who "listens" to the entire community and someone with a true "vision" to utilize this rare opportunity.

Thank you,  
Sincerely and trying to smile,  
Donna West  
[dwestsfo@gmail.com](mailto:dwestsfo@gmail.com)  
Direct: 408-564-0751  
District 3

## Julie Minot

---

**From:** Judy Tucker <judytucker@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 3:01 PM  
**To:** Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Development near train station

Dear Mayor and City Council,

We are registered voters in District 5 which seems to be the target for much development that has been exhausting to track. Now another development was announced with an expensive, large City publication as if it is a done deal without community input - is the City above developers who go through proper channels?

Is this the City's or Republic Metropolitan's approach? If Re/Met's, I oppose any partnership with them as they have clearly shown they are not an appropriate partner on any project. What's best for the residents of Santa Clara should always be considered first and foremost.

This development seems to benefit SCU with private dorm housing and a sports medicine clinic ON CITY OWNED LAND that should benefit all of Santa Clara.

The dorm style housing is especially egregious as these rentals cost significantly more per square foot than other styles of housing, and per-bed leases discriminate against families. The City requires 15% affordable housing on new developments and should meet that minimum on its own land. The City should not be allowed to "double-count" VTA's affordable component toward its own requirements.

Despite being called the Santa Clara Station, this development has not made allowances for the transit focus of this parcel. They have not adequately planned for parking for Caltrain, and the design turns its back on transit and Historic Franklin Street. The impact on the historic train station (registered on the National Register of Historic Places - NRHP), the site itself (which lies within the Santa Clara Third Mission area and is eligible for listing with the NRHP), the Police Station, nearby businesses, relocating the well on this site, traffic, costs and potential inconvenience have not been communicated, let alone discussed.

The Mayor and City council should vote no on the ENA renewal since this project does not appear to meet the community's needs, and Re/Met has shown that they are uninterested in engaging with the community. This site should only be developed after actually considering (rather than ignoring) community input.

Sincerely,

Charles and Judy Tucker  
<>

## Julie Minot

---

**From:** David Meyer <david@siliconvalleyathome.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 10:57 AM  
**To:** Mayor and Council; Lisa Gillmor; Kathy Watanabe; Raj Chahal; Karen Hardy; Teresa O'Neill; Debi Davis  
**Cc:** Mathew Reed; Kriti Garg; Clerk; Andrew Crabtree  
**Subject:** SV@Home letter RE: Item 3 - 500 Benton ENA  
**Attachments:** 071420 SVH Letter RE - Item 3 - 500 Benton ENA (final).pdf

Dear Mayor Gillmor, Vice Mayor Hardy, and Councilmembers Davis, Chahal, Watanabe, and O'Neill:

On behalf of SV@Home, we write the attached letter today to oppose the extension of the Exclusive Negotiations Agreement (ENA) for the site located at 500 Benton Street in Santa Clara. The current proposal for the site does not rise to the opportunity for affordable housing at a critical transit hub and raises significant concerns about compliance with state law.

SV@Home wants to thank the Valley Transit Authority (VTA) for all of its work to ensure that their land at the Santa Clara Station is used for much needed affordable workforce housing. We appreciate VTA's leadership in leveraging publicly-owned land to build affordable, transit-oriented housing. The remainder of the proposal for the site, however, falls short of city, regional, and state goals.

We need to set high standards for city-owned land. It is a limited, valuable resource that should be deployed to meet Santa Clara's affordable housing needs. Additionally, the strengthening of the State Surplus Land Act through 2019's AB1482 is only one of the latest in a string of legislative and judicial decisions that directly link surplus public land and affordable housing development. SV@Home is concerned that state law regarding surplus land has not been adequately followed in this case. Indeed, the prioritization of student housing for this location does not take full advantage of the transit-rich opportunity presented by future increased Caltrain service and the Silicon Valley BART extension.

As a housing advocacy organization, SV@Home does not take opposing specific housing proposals lightly. Santa Clara should build off of the precedent set by VTA prioritizing affordable development on its land and ensure that the 500 Benton site both reflects local needs for affordable housing and conforms with state law on surplus land.

Sincerely,

David

David Meyer  
Director of Strategic Initiatives  
408-462-1572  
[david@siliconvalleyathome.org](mailto:david@siliconvalleyathome.org)

Everyone deserves a safe, stable, and  
affordable home.

JOIN US IN MAKING THAT A REALITY!  
BECOME A MEMBER TODAY.

sv@home



Act with us. [Become a member](#) today and join us in making home a reality for all.  
For all other COVID-19 related housing updates & resources [click here](#)

**Board of Directors**

Kevin Zwick, *Chair*  
*United Way Bay Area*

Gina Dalma, *Vice Chair*  
*Silicon Valley Community*  
*Foundation*

Kathy Thibodeaux, *Secretary*  
*KM Thibodeaux Consulting LLC*

Andrea Osgood, *Treasurer*  
*Eden Housing*

Shiloh Ballard  
*Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition*

Bob Brownstein  
*Working Partnerships USA*

Katie Ferrick  
*LinkedIn*

Amie Fishman  
*Non-Profit Housing Association of*  
*Northern California*

Ron Gonzales  
*Hispanic Foundation*  
*of Silicon Valley*

Candice Gonzalez  
*Sand Hill Property Company*

Javier Gonzalez  
*Google*

Poncho Guevara  
*Sacred Heart Community Service*

Janice Jensen  
*Habitat for Humanity*  
*East Bay/Silicon Valley*

Janikke Klem  
*Technology Credit Union*

Jan Lindenthal  
*MidPen Housing*

Jennifer Loving  
*Destination: Home*

Mary Murtagh  
*EAH Housing*

Chris Neale  
*The Core Companies*

Kelly Snider  
*Kelly Snider Consulting*

Jennifer Van Every  
*The Van Every Group*

**Staff**  
Leslye Corsiglia  
*Executive Director*

July 14, 2020

Honorable Mayor Gillmor and Members of the City Council  
City of Santa Clara  
1500 Warburton Avenue  
Santa Clara, CA

Dear Mayor Gillmor, Vice Mayor Hardy, and Councilmembers Davis, Chahal, Watanabe, and O'Neill:

**RE: Agenda Item #3: Authorize the Negotiation and Execution of a Third Amendment to the Exclusive Negotiations Agreement with Republic Metropolitan LLC for the site located at 500 Benton Street**

On behalf of SV@Home, we write today to oppose the extension of the Exclusive Negotiations Agreement (ENA) for the site located at 500 Benton Street in Santa Clara. The current proposal for the site does not rise to the opportunity for affordable housing at a critical transit hub and raises significant concerns about compliance with state law.

SV@Home wants to thank the Valley Transit Authority (VTA) for all of its work to ensure that their land at the Santa Clara Station is used for much needed affordable workforce housing. We appreciate VTA's leadership in leveraging publicly-owned land to build affordable, transit-oriented housing. The remainder of the proposal for the site, however, falls short of city, regional, and state goals.

We need to set high standards for city-owned land. It is a limited, valuable resource that should be deployed to meet Santa Clara's affordable housing needs. Additionally, the strengthening of the State Surplus Land Act through 2019's AB1482 is only one of the latest in a string of legislative and judicial decisions that directly link surplus public land and affordable housing development. SV@Home is concerned that state law regarding surplus land has not been adequately followed in this case. Indeed, the prioritization of student housing for this location does not take full advantage of the transit-rich opportunity presented by future increased Caltrain service and the Silicon Valley BART extension.

As a housing advocacy organization, SV@Home does not take opposing specific housing proposals lightly. Santa Clara should build off of the precedent set by VTA prioritizing affordable development on its land and ensure that the 500 Benton site both reflects local needs for affordable housing and conforms with state law on surplus land.

Sincerely,



David K Meyer  
Director of Strategic Initiatives