



Californians Advocating
Responsible Rail Design

1825 Emerson Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Phone: 650.814.1820
Email: nadianaik@carrdnet.org

Via email

March 7, 2011

**Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority
Board of Directors**
3331 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95134

**LAFCO of Santa Clara County
Board of Directors**
70 West Hedding Street
11th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

**Santa Clara County
Board of Supervisors**
70 West Hedding Street
11th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

**City of Gilroy
Mayor and City Council**
7351 Rosanna Street
Gilroy, CA 95020-6197

SUBJECT: City of Gilroy High Speed Train Station Comparative Visioning Project

Dear VTA Board Members, LAFCO Board Members, Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors and City of Gilroy Mayor and Council members,

At the VTA board meeting held on March 3rd, 2011, the board approved the programming of \$150,000 in Local Program Reserve (LPR) funds for the City of Gilroy High Speed Train Station Comparative Visioning Project to analyze two completely unique station locations and alignments. Per VTA's staff report: "One station alternative is in a small city downtown core location with a mature roadway network, existing transportation services and built infrastructure. The other station alternative is in a rural agricultural area outside the city limits with no road network, infrastructure or supporting transit services."

We'd like to draw your attention to the fact that the proposed station in this rural area, described by the California High Speed Rail Authority as the "East Gilroy Station", would seem to be a direct violation of an existing 20 year inter-jurisdictional agreement between LAFCO, the City of Gilroy and the County Board of Supervisors.

The East Gilroy Station would fall within a protected area described in the inter-jurisdictional agreement entitled, "Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability," which was endorsed by the City of Gilroy on September 23, 1996, LAFCO on October 9, 1996 and the County Board of Supervisors on October 29, 1996. This agreement (attached) is "primarily comprised of the lands east of U.S. 101, south of Buena Vista Avenue to the County boundary." The LAFCO agreement is intended to "strengthen the '20 year planning boundary' in the area that has been in effect since 1979 as part of the City of Gilroy's General Plan."

The proposed East Gilroy Station would be in the northernmost part of the protected area in the unincorporated part of Santa Clara County. The alignment would bisect this protected area and would include a station with commensurate parking and other structures with the intent of creating a very dense area around the station.

CARRD recommends that before funding this initiative, the Santa Clara Board of Supervisors, LAFCO, the City of Gilroy and VTA should review the intra-jurisdictional agreement and discuss the ramifications of these plans. The agreement describes that there can be amendments to the agreement if certain conditions are met and that the City must provide this information at the time of application.

From the agreement:

“Factors to be considered, both for endorsement of an amended boundary and for any specific proposal, will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. City's demonstration of how mitigation for previous USA expansion projects will continue to be provided, in cases where the mitigation for loss of prime agricultural land within the 20 year boundary line east of U.S. 101 depended upon the stabilization of that boundary as it existed in 1996.
- b. The City's participation in efforts to support the viability of agriculture business and the preservation of agricultural lands, including strategies listed in the adopted "Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability."
- c. Whether the conversion of agricultural and other open space lands is premature, based upon the availability of other areas of vacant land having the same land use designation already within the USA.
- d. The ability of the City to provide adequate urban services without detracting from current service levels or incurring excessive infrastructure or services costs.
- e. The ability of school districts to provide school facilities.
- f. The role of special districts in providing services.
- g. Consideration of public safety hazards within the expansion area, including flood hazards.
- h. The impact of public facilities, such as roads, upon adjacent agricultural lands.
- i. Fiscal impacts upon affected agencies.”

CARRD recommends that LAFCO either reaffirm the policies set forth in the agreement, or that the City of Gilroy formally request an amendment to the agreement prior to beginning its High Speed Train Station Comparative Visioning Project.

In addition, it is important to note that the East Gilroy Station alternative was NOT studied in the Program EIR for the San Jose to Merced section of the California High Speed Rail Project and has therefore not been vetted through the CEQA and NEPA processes.

Additionally, the East Gilroy Station alternative violates the Authority's own guidelines as described in their document titled, High Speed Train Station Area Development Principals and Guidelines. From that document:

The Authority has prescribed the following criteria for HST station locations:

- To be considered for a station, the proposed site must have the potential to promote higher density, mixed-use, pedestrian accessible development around the station.
- As the HST project proceeds to more detailed study, and before a final station location decision is made, the responsible local government(s) are expected to provide (through planning and zoning) for TOD around HST station locations.
- Give priority to stations for which the city and/or county has adopted station area TOD plans and general plans that focus and prioritize development on the TOD areas rather than on auto-oriented outlying areas.
- As the project proceeds to more detailed study, local governments are expected to finance (e.g., through value-capture or other financing techniques) the public spaces needed to support the pedestrian/bicycle traffic generated by hub stations, as well as identifying long-term maintenance of the spaces.

Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design (CARRD) is a volunteer, grassroots group that has been following the high speed rail project statewide for two years. Our group does not advocate for a particular alignment or route given that we believe local communities must be partners with the Authority in developing and determining the alternatives that balance transportation goals and community concerns.

We urge VTA, LAFCO, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors and the City of Gilroy to review their policies and procedures and to work together to determine the viability of station alternatives for Gilroy.

Sincerely,

Nadia Naik
 Co-founder, CARRD
 Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design
www.calhsr.com

Attachments:

1. VTA Staff Report for Feb 18, 2011
2. LAFCO Intra-jurisdictional Agreement - *“Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability”*
3. California High Speed Rail Authority guidelines - *“High Speed Train Station Area Development Principals and Guidelines”*

cc: CHSRA Board Members
 CHSRA CEO Roelof van Ark
 Senator Elaine Alquist
 Assemblymember Luis Alejo

Committee for Green Foothills
 Greenbelt Alliance
 Santa Clara County Farm Bureau
 TransFORM



Date: February 8, 2011
 Current Meeting: February 18, 2011
 Board Meeting: March 3, 2011

BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
 Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Local Program Reserve: Gilroy High Speed Train Station Selection

Policy-Related Action: Yes

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the programming of \$150,000 in Local Program Reserve (LPR) funds for the Gilroy High Speed Train Station Comparative Visioning project.

BACKGROUND:

The High Speed Rail (HSR) alignment into the Bay Area following the Pacheco Pass alignment specifies a station in Gilroy. The City of Gilroy has been directed by the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) to identify the location of the station by September 2011.

DISCUSSION:

The City of Gilroy is in a unique situation. Whereas most cities being considered for High Speed Rail stations are analyzing issues of vertical alignment and access, Gilroy is analyzing two completely unique station location and alignments. One station alternative is in a small city downtown core location with a mature roadway network existing transit services and built infrastructure. The other station alternative is in a rural agricultural area outside the city limits with no road network, infrastructure or supporting transit services. Because of these differences, Gilroy has the task of analyzing two very different visions of how HSR will work in Gilroy's future planning efforts.

The Gilroy City Council's decision will direct major passenger rail investment in the southern half of Santa Clara County for the next 50 years. Land use decisions made in concert with station location decision will also impact the shape of urban development in the south county area. This project has the potential to create a major new rail line where none exists today, as well as a new

transit hub with connections to Central Coast counties of San Benito, Monterey and Santa Cruz.

On November 15, 2010, VTA issued a call for Community Design in Transportation (CDT) Planning Grant project proposals. The City of Gilroy submitted an application for its' High Speed Train Station Comparative Visioning project. This proposal is to fund the planning work necessary for the Gilroy City Council to make informed decisions with regard to locating the future High Speed Rail station either in downtown Gilroy, or within the unincorporated area east of US 101, within Gilroy's sphere of influence.

The CDT program is geographically constrained to funding planning within existing downtowns, business districts, and major transit corridors and the funding level is capped at \$150,000. Most of Gilroy's work will be outside of these areas, and the request was therefore ineligible for the CDT program.

The project is also ineligible for any of VTA's other current grant programs. VTA staff consulted with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) staff with regard to MTC's Station Area Planning program which previously provided a \$750,000 planning grant for Diridon Station, supplemented by \$100,000 from VTA. MTC is currently soliciting proposals for this program, and while Santa Clara and the Peninsula cities would be eligible by virtue of having existing rail stations, Gilroy's potential new station, and other scope elements are not. VTA staff therefore considers this proposal to be a special situation where a regional fund investment is justified. VTA staff recommends that the Board program \$150,000 of Local Program Reserve funds to this project.

Staff also proposes to work with the CIP to review and update the CDT scoring criteria to incorporate changes that may be identified by the development of the new Regional Transportation Plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board may choose not to fund this project, or to fund it at a different amount.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is sufficient appropriation for this expenditure in the FY11 Adopted 1996 Measure B Transportation Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget.

Prepared by: Marcella Rensi
Memo No. 2975

POLICIES FOR GILROY AGRICULTURAL LANDS AREA

Statement of Intent:

It is the intent of LAFCO to establish policies for the area east and south of the City of Gilroy, to reflect the inter-jurisdictional agreement entitled "[Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability](#)," which was endorsed by the City of Gilroy on September 23, 1996, LAFCO on October 9, 1996 and the County Board of Supervisors on October 29, 1996. The agreement is intended to ensure the economic viability of agricultural businesses and to preserve productive agricultural lands south and east of Gilroy for continued agricultural use.

The agreement is primarily comprised of lands east of U.S. 101, south of Buena Vista Avenue to the County boundary, shown as the "agricultural preserve area" on the 1996 map prepared for this agreement, entitled "Gilroy Development Boundaries," included as Exhibit A to these policies. These policies will refer to this area as the Gilroy Agricultural Lands Area.

It is the intent of LAFCO to establish these policies in recognition of the commitment of the City of Gilroy to strengthen the "20 year planning boundary" in the area east of U.S. 101, as part of the inter-jurisdictional agreement. The City's 20 year planning boundary has been in effect since 1979, as part of the City's General Plan.

Some of the policies for the Gilroy Agricultural Lands Area are the same as those listed in previously established LAFCO Policies and Guidelines. They have been included in this section to form a complete set of policies for the Gilroy Agricultural Lands Area.

Policies:

1. LAFCO supports the City's "20 year boundary" east of U.S. 101, as it existed in 1996, and will not approve any Urban Service Area (USA) expansion request and/or reorganization proposal to the north, east or south of this portion of the 20 year boundary, except as provided in Policy No. 6 below. An additional exception to this policy would be lands needed for the specific purpose of expanding the South County Regional Waste Water Authority (SCRWA) plant.
2. LAFCO acknowledges the City's adoption of a stable 20 year boundary east of U.S. 101 to be an effective measure of protection for a significant amount of important agricultural lands east and south of Gilroy, and also acknowledges those lands within the existing 20 year boundary are less likely to remain in long term agricultural use.
3. When reviewing proposals within the 20 year boundary east of U.S. 101 on lands that have agricultural or open space value (regardless of the City zoning

designation), LAFCO may consider this boundary, together with actions taken to implement the other agricultural protection strategies of the inter-jurisdictional agreement, to be a mitigation for the loss of prime soils, agricultural land and/or open space.

4. Urban service area expansion proposals within the 20 year boundary east of U.S. 101 must be contiguous to the current urban service area boundary, and may not include lands under current Williamson Act contract, unless the landowner has applied for non-renewal of the Williamson Act contract within the time limits prescribed in the contract.
5. In addition to the conditions listed above in Policy No. 4 above, LAFCO will consider City urban service area requests specifically within the 20 year boundary east of U.S. 101, as it existed in 1996, based upon, but not limited to, the following factors. The City shall provide this information at the time of application.
 - a. The City's ability to provide adequate urban services without detracting from current service levels.
 - b. Analysis of why the conversion of land to urban uses is necessary to promote planned, orderly, efficient development of the city, given the existing amount of similarly designated vacant land within the existing USA .
 - c. The ability of school districts to provide school facilities.
 - d. The role of special districts in providing services.
 - e. Fiscal impacts of the proposal upon affected agencies.
6. If the City amends the 20-year boundary east of U.S. 101 as it existed in 1996, LAFCO will carefully consider the amendment before endorsement of the new boundary. LAFCO will not approve any City proposals outside of the 1996 boundary east of U.S. 101 unless the commission has endorsed the amended 20-year boundary. Factors to be considered, both for endorsement of an amended boundary and for any specific proposal, will include, but not be limited to, the following. The City shall provide this information at the time of application.
 - a. City's demonstration of how mitigation for previous USA expansion projects will continue to be provided, in cases where the mitigation for loss of prime agricultural land within the 20 year boundary line east of U.S. 101 depended upon the stabilization of that boundary as it existed in 1996.
 - b. The City's participation in efforts to support the viability of agriculture business and the preservation of agricultural lands, including strategies listed in the adopted "*Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability.*"

- c. Whether the conversion of agricultural and other open space lands is premature, based upon the availability of other areas of vacant land having the same land use designation already within the USA.
 - d. The ability of the City to provide adequate urban services without detracting from current service levels or incurring excessive infrastructure or services costs.
 - e. The ability of school districts to provide school facilities.
 - f. The role of special districts in providing services.
 - g. Consideration of public safety hazards within the expansion area, including flood hazards.
 - h. The impact of public facilities, such as roads, upon adjacent agricultural lands.
 - i. Fiscal impacts upon affected agencies.
7. LAFCO will only consider amending the Urban Service Area every twelve months, in keeping with previously established LAFCO Policies And Guidelines. The City may submit several requests in one application, and may combine requests in the Gilroy Agricultural Lands Area with proposals from other portions of the city for consideration. As with any urban service area expansion proposal, each geographic area will be considered separately.

Adopted February 12, 1997

6 HST STATION AREA DEVELOPMENT

There would be great benefits to enhancing development patterns and increasing development densities near proposed HST stations. To provide maximum opportunity for station area development in accordance with the purpose, need, and objectives for the HST system, the preferred HST station locations would be multi-modal transportation hubs and would typically be in traditional city centers. To further these objectives, when making decisions regarding both the final selection of station locations and the timing of station development, the Authority would consider the extent to which appropriate station area plans and development principles have been adopted by local authorities.

In addition to potential benefits from minimizing land consumption needs for new growth, dense development near HST stations would concentrate activity conveniently located to stations. This would increase the use of the HST system, generating additional HST ridership and revenue to benefit the entire state. It also would accommodate new growth on a smaller footprint. Reducing the land needed for new growth should reduce pressure for new development on nearby habitat areas, in environmentally fragile or hazardous areas, and on agricultural lands. Denser development allowances would also enhance joint development opportunities at and near the station, which in turn could increase the likelihood of private financial participation in construction and operations related to the HST system. A dense development pattern can better support a comprehensive and extensive local transit and shuttle system, bike¹ and pedestrian paths, and related amenities that can serve the local communities as well as provide access and egress to HST stations. The Authority's adopted policies would ensure that implementation of the HST in California would maximize station area development that serves the local community and economy while increasing HST ridership.

6.1 General Principles for HST Station Area Development

HST station area development principles draw on TOD strategies that have been successfully applied to focus compact growth within walking distance of rail stations and other transit facilities. Applying TOD measures around HST stations is a strategy that works for large, dense urban areas, as well as smaller central cities and suburban areas. TOD can produce a variety of other local and regional benefits by encouraging walkable, bikable compact and infill development. Local governments would play a significant role in implementing station area development by adopting plans, policies, zoning provisions, and incentives for higher densities, and by approving a mix of urban land uses. Almost all TOD measures adopted by public agencies involve some form of overlay zoning that designates a station area for development intensification, mixed land uses, and improvements to the pedestrian/bicycle environment. TOD measures are generally applied to areas within one-half mile of transit stations, and this principal would be followed for HST stations.

Station area development principles that would be applied at the project level for each HST station and the areas around the stations would include the following features:

- Higher density development in relation to the existing pattern of development in the surrounding area, along with minimum requirements for density.
- A mix of land uses (e.g., retail, office, hotels, entertainment, residential) and a mix of housing types to meet the needs of the local community.
- A grid street pattern and compact pedestrian-oriented design that promotes walking, bicycle, and transit access with streetscapes that include landscaping, small parks, pedestrian spaces, bike lanes and bike racks.

¹ HST will include facilities to accommodate bicycles.

- Context-sensitive building design that considers the continuity of the building sizes and that coordinates the street-level and upper-level architectural detailing, roof forms, and the rhythm of windows and doors should be provided. New buildings should be designed to complement and mutually support public spaces, such as streets, plazas, other open space areas, and public parking structures.
- Limits on the amount of parking for new development and a preference that parking be placed in structures. TOD areas typically have reduced parking requirements for retail, office, and residential uses due to their transit access and walkability. Sufficient train passenger parking would be essential to the system viability, but this should, as appropriate, be offered at market rates (not free) to encourage the use of access by transit and other modes. Shared parking would be planned when the mix of uses would support it.

6.2 Implementation of HST Station Area Development Guidelines

The statewide HST system is likely to have more than 20 stations. The Authority has the powers necessary to oversee the construction and operation of a statewide high-speed rail system and to purchase the land required for the infrastructure and operations of the system. The responsibility and powers needed to focus growth and station area development guidelines in the areas around high-speed stations are likely to reside primarily with local government.

The primary ways in which the Authority can help ensure that the HST system becomes an instrument for encouraging maximizing implementation of station area development principles include:

- Select station locations that are multi-modal transportation hubs with a preference for traditional city centers.
- Adopt HST station area development policies and principles that require TOD, and promote value-capture at and around station areas as a condition for selecting a HST station site.
- Provide incentives for local governments where potential HST stations may be located to prepare and adopt Station Area Plans and to amend City and County General Plans that incorporate station area development principles in the vicinity of HST stations.

6.2.1 Select Station Locations that Are Multi-Modal Transportation Hubs, Preferably in Traditional City Centers.

HST stations in California would be multi-modal transportation hubs. To meet the Authority's adopted objectives², the locations that were selected as potential HST stations would provide linkage with local and regional transit, airports, and highways. In particular, convenient links to other rail services (heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, and conventional intercity) would promote TOD at stations by increasing ridership and pedestrian activity at these *hub* stations. A high level of accessibility and activity at the stations can make the nearby area more attractive for additional economic activity.

Most of the potential stations identified for further evaluation are located in the heart of the downtown/central city area of California's major cities. By eliminating potential *greenfield* sites³, the Authority has described a proposed HST system that meets the objectives of minimizing potential impacts on the environment and maximizing connectivity with other modes of transportation. These locations also would have the most potential to support infill development and TOD.

² See the final statewide program EIR/EIS (California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration 2005), Section 1.2.1 ,Purpose of High-Speed Train System.

³ Sites in rural areas with very limited or no existing infrastructure.

6.2.2 Adopt HST Station Area Development Policies that Require TOD, and Promote Value-Capture at and around Stations as a Condition for Selecting a HST Station Site

Through subsequent CEQA and NEPA processes, the Authority would determine where stations would be located and how many HST stations there would be. The Authority has identified TOD and value-capture at and around stations sites as essential for promoting HST ridership. The Authority would work with local governments to ensure these policies are adopted and implemented.⁴

Local government would be expected to promote TOD and to use value-capture techniques to finance and maintain station amenities and the public spaces needed to create an attractive pedestrian environment. Because the HST stations would be public gathering places, value-capture techniques should be used to enhance station designs with additional transportation or public facilities. It is the Authority's policy that parking for HST services at HST stations should, as appropriate, be provided at market rates (no free parking). The Authority would maximize application of TOD principles during the site-specific review of proposed station locations. In addition, for HST stations in the Central Valley, the Authority will undertake a comprehensive economic study of the kinds of businesses that would uniquely benefit from being located near HST station areas, including a thoroughgoing estimate of the kinds and numbers of jobs that such businesses would create.

The Authority has prescribed the following criteria for HST station locations:

- To be considered for a station, the proposed site must have the potential to promote higher density, mixed-use, pedestrian accessible development around the station.
- As the HST project proceeds to more detailed study, and before a final station location decision is made, the responsible local government(s) are expected to provide (through planning and zoning) for TOD around HST station locations.
- Give priority to stations for which the city and/or county has adopted station area TOD plans and general plans that focus and prioritize development on the TOD areas rather than on auto-oriented outlying areas.
- As the project proceeds to more detailed study, local governments are expected to finance (e.g., through value-capture or other financing techniques) the public spaces needed to support the pedestrian/bicycle traffic generated by hub stations, as well as identifying long-term maintenance of the spaces.

The imperative to link transportation investments with supportive land use was made clear in a recent study by the MTC. The study showed that people who both live and work within a half mile of a rail stop use transit for 42% of their work trips, more than 10 times as much as others in the region.⁵

Both BART and MTC have adopted policies that link funding for transit expansion with land use. In July 2005, MTC adopted a TOD policy for regional expansion projects to help improve the cost effectiveness of regional investments. The TOD policy calls for a minimum threshold of housing within a half mile of new transit stations. For communities that do not meet the threshold, MTC provides grants to cities for community-based planning processes.

⁴ As part of the "Staff Recommendations" adopted at the January 26, 2005, Authority Board Meeting in Sacramento.

⁵ Characteristics of Rail and Ferry Station Area Residents in the San Francisco Bay Area: Evidence from the 2000 Bay Area Travel Survey. Volume 1. MTC, September 2006.

BART's Strategic Plan mandates that BART partner with communities to make investment choices that encourage and support TOD and increased transit use. BART's System Expansion Policy helps determine where new expansions will go, in part based on a commitment by the municipality to help generate new ridership with transit-supportive growth and development, as well as a high level of access by local transit, bicycle, and walking to the new station. The BART and MTC policies offer different approaches for TOD; one uses minimum thresholds for housing units and the other that focuses on a level of ridership provided. The Authority will analyze these policies and others like it throughout the country in developing specific TOD guidelines.

6.2.3 Provide Incentives for Local Governments in which Potential HST Stations Would Be Located to Prepare and Adopt Station Area Plans, Amend City and County General Plans, and Encourage TOD in the Vicinity of HST Stations

Throughout future environmental processes and the implementation of the HST, the Authority would continue to work closely with the communities being considered for HST stations. It is important to understand HST as a system that will have regional as well as statewide ridership. It will provide an opportunity to improve and expand local transit systems leading to the HST stations and to have additional job and housing growth along those transit corridors.

Local governments can use a number of mechanisms to encourage higher density HST-oriented development in and around potential HST station locations and to minimize undesirable growth effects. These include developing plans (such as specific plans, transit village plans, regional plans, and greenbelts), development agreements, zoning overlays, and, in some cases, use of redevelopment authority.

Increased density of development in and around HST stations would provide public benefits beyond the benefits of access to the HST system itself. Such benefits could include relief from traffic congestion, improved air quality, promotion of infill development, preservation of natural resources, more affordable housing, promotion of job opportunities, reduction in energy consumption, and better use of public infrastructure. The Authority and local government working together would determine which mechanisms best suit each community and could be implemented to enhance the benefits possible from potential HST station development.

Most successful contemporary examples of urban development are the product of long-term strategic planning. For example, in France and Japan, where there has been considerable success guiding new development around HST stations, local governments typically prepare long-term plans that focus growth at each HST station area. Regional plans are also typically used to coordinate station area development with existing urban areas and reserves for parks, agriculture, and natural habitat.

Over the last 5 years, four of the major regions of California—Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, and the Bay Area—have developed regional blueprints. Eight counties in the Central Valley are now conducting their own blueprint process. All of these blueprints focus on supporting the existing downtowns and increasing transit ridership as critical ways for future growth to be environmentally and economically sustainable. The HST could provide a major boost to these blueprints by greatly increasing access to the downtowns, directly supporting local and regional rail systems, and indirectly supporting bus and light rail systems with an infusion of additional riders.

A useful starting point for station area development is to work with the community to identify needs and missing assets they would like to see as part of any new development, such as parks, libraries, and food stores and to assess the market sizes needed to attract and retain such uses. Local government can also review the availability of land around potential station sites to achieve development that is of sufficient size to be economically viable. Then an illustrative site and phasing plan for a station area that is realistic from a market perspective can be developed and shared with the community. Finally, a station area plan can be prepared, which would ensure the community and potential developers of a public commitment to

promote compact, efficient, TOD around station areas. Infrastructure improvements for station area development should be included in the station area plan.

Significant growth is expected in large areas of California with or without an HST system. The proposed HST system, however, would be consistent with and promote the state's adopted smart growth principles⁶ and could be a catalyst for wider adoption of smart growth principles in communities near HST stations. With strong companion policies and good planning, HST stations should encourage infill development, help protect environmental and agricultural resources by encouraging more efficient land use, and minimize ongoing cost to taxpayers by making better use of our existing infrastructure.

The Authority's selection of station locations and the timing of station development would consider adherence to the principles in the section. In pursuing its objective of providing a profitable and successful HST, the Authority will use its resources, both financial and otherwise, to encourage the local government authority with development jurisdiction at and around potential HST stations to take the following steps:

- In partnership with the Authority, develop a station area plan⁷ for all land within a half mile of the HST pedestrian entrance that adheres to the station area development principles (described above).
- Use a community planning process to plan the street, pedestrian, bicycle environment, parks and open spaces, and other amenities.
- Incorporate the station area plan through amendment of the city or county general plan and zoning.
- Use community planning processes to develop regional plans and conform amendments to general plans, which would focus development in existing communities and would provide for long-term protection of farmland, habitat, and open space.

6 As expressed in the Wiggins Bill (AB857, 2003), and in government code 65041.1.

7 Such a plan could take the form of a specific plan pursuant to California Government Code sections 65450–65457 or a Transit Village Development Plan pursuant to California Government Code sections 65460–65460.10, which specify the content for such a plan, or another form as determined appropriate by local government.