

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2016**

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLISHED AGENDA

From: Julie Machado <

Date: March 12, 2016 at 12:06:15 PM PST

To: Fran David <fran.david@hayward-ca.gov>, Marvin Peixoto <marvin.peixoto@hayward-ca.gov>, Sara Lamnin <sara.lamnin@hayward-ca.gov>, Elisa Marquez <elisa.marquez@hayward-ca.gov>, Barbara Halliday <barbara.halliday@hayward-ca.gov>, "Greg Jones" <greg.jones@hayward-ca.gov>, Francisco Zermeno <fzermeno@chabotcollege.edu>, Al and Kindra Mendall <al.mendall@hayward-ca.gov>, Al Parso <al.parso@hayward-ca.gov>, Hayward City Clerk <cityclerk@hayward-ca.gov>, Sherman Lewis <sherman.lewis@hayward-ca.gov>, Ben Goulart <ben.goulart@hayward-ca.gov>, Frank Goulart <frank.goulart@hayward-ca.gov>

Subject: Comment on Maple & Main Project

Reply-To: Julie Machado <

The planned work session for Maple and Main this coming Thursday is a SHAM because the Environmental Review is not done, so *the City will not allow the public to see the Traffic Study or Soils Study on this project.*

I am sure that the City and this developer are planning to do a "Negative Dec" meaning they will not have to do an EIR - despite there being massive parking, and height issues with this project. Not to mention a history of Indian bones being found on the site, and the history of the current parking lot previously being a small lake, leading to possible liquefaction issues in the soil. And traffic???

We think this project is of such a magnitude that there should be a work session AFTER the Environmental Review is complete and available to the public.

Julie Machado

-----Original Message-----

From: Sherman Lewis

On Behalf Of Sherman Lewis

Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 9:54 PM

To: Marcus Stevens; Frank Goulart; Julie Machado; Al Parso; List-Mayor-Council; Ben Goulart; Joy Rowan; Nancy Schluntz; Bruce Barrett; Evelyn Cormier; Gail Lundholm; Minane Jameson; Steve Murtaugh; Dustyn Bindel; Alison

Cc: Rebecca Parr; cecily burt; fred zehnder

Subject: Maple & Main Project

Here is my take on the recent email exchanges.

Prospect Hill people and HAPA want more information and serious consideration of an alternative and lacking that, a work session is fraud. From the critics point of view too many issues are left out and too much is going on behind closed doors. We keep making requests and asking questions and not getting answers.

City staff gets applications from developers on land they control and works with them to get a complete application and consider public comment, which can influence the details of the project. From staff's point of view a work session is a good opportunity for Council and the public to learn about the project.

At this point communication breaks down. Traditionally, work sessions are controlled by staff and the developer and cover design and limited planning aspects. Staff does not let the public know what they are thinking about traffic, Indian remains, liquefaction, form code issues, building bulk issues, conformity to land use designation and zoning, and sustainable alternatives.

There will be no work session on an alternative no matter how well formulated.

Staff has some things it wants to accomplish, the developer can engage in real discussion, and the Council can give direction, but doesn't. That's it. The traditional process leads to a document dump on a Friday before a Tuesday decision, with no real back and forth on citizen concerns. On Tuesday the Council is faced with millions of dollars invested in the applicants proposal versus opponents cornered by this process into opposing the whole thing with no real time to review and with no consideration of a sustainable alternative.

Above all, staff does not cover sustainable projects serving the same purpose.

The process is set up to review the developer's project; staff does not have the mandate or the resources to work with proponents of sustainability. Staff says it cares about citizen input but in reality it cannot respond outside a narrow range of concerns. The environmental checklist is kept in house, so we tell the City what we think and the City does not respond. This creates mistrust, suspicion that a consultant will tweak any grey area toward a biased, secret, and predetermined outcome of a neg dec.

Hayward has already made two bad decisions, to destroy a building that could easily be used for a community center and to place high speed traffic capacity ahead of sustainability and access to downtown. There is hopefully time to reverse these decisions, but that is not the case with Maple Main and Lincoln Landing. They cannot be reversed, and will commit to Hayward to car-based development unfriendly to pedestrian access to downtown for a long time to come.

This is a problem best solved by Council giving staff direction to consider a sustainable alternative and work with proponents on the details, and to release to citizens the information government has as soon as government has it. I know you may feel you lack a specific legal mandate to do this and lack staff

resources, but you can still adopt a policy direction in favor of open government and engagement with citizens trying to promote sustainable growth downtown. You can give, or at least try to give, give citizens as much time and staff to work with the city as you give to the developer.

--

Sherman Lewis
Academic Senator for Emeriti
Professor Emeritus, Political Science
Cal State East Bay Hayward
President, Hayward Area Planning Association

www.bayviewvillage.us