

BERG & BERG ENTERPRISES, INC.

*10050 Bandlely Drive
Cupertino, CA 95014-2188
(408) 725-0700 - fax (408) 725-1626*

7/24/03

Dave Clarke

City of San Jose
Public Works, Development Services Division
801 N. First Street, Room 308
San Jose, CA 95110
Ph 408-277-5161 277-3833 Fax 408-277-3879 page 1 of 1
Dave.Clarke@ci.sj.ca.us

Reference: Draft Ordinance CIMP

Subject: Comments & Questions

Dave,

1) I assume any permit stamped "Minor Improvement Permit" is excluded from this ordinance. That would leave "Construction Agreements" as the only agreements falling under this CIMP and only if it met the criteria of your proposed section 13.36.140 regardless of dollar amount, is that correct ?

2) Section 13.36.140 stipulates

a. Impact intersections ~ What does impact entail, this is wide open and vague leaving the project proponent open to complaints for even minor items or inconveniences.

c. Project located within 500 foot of another project. Both projects could minor in themselves but require a plan simply because another projects exists and require burdensome paperwork and costs and yet not significantly impact the public.

3) 13.36.100 Planning already requires project noticing and comment period on projects. Are you proposing to add another round of noticing. That is unreasonable and redundant.

4) 13.36.110 Aside from making sure vehicular current access is maintained and only minimally impacted no new program should be required.

5) 13.36.120 This section begs trouble and extra costs from potentially affected individuals over very minor issues. We all have to tolerate some inconveniences to facilitate improving public roadways and in the end we all benefit. The amount of scheduling of meetings with other seems extensive. Most entities just want to see the job done, get on with it. What problems had you had before that couldn't simply be handled by your existing work plan procedures. We second the Chamber of Commerce comments in this area.

6) 13.36.130 Utility outages obviously have to be avoided if possible or failing that, scheduled off hours and access needs to be maintained but these sections appear to be too expansive and nebulous. Once again we would second the Chamber of Commerce comments in this area. What problems had you had before that couldn't simply be handled by your existing work plan procedures.

We are being barraged by countless government agencies increasing fees and imposing new requirements which are burdensome and costly for business with the net result that business is fleeing to foreign countries and homes are becoming more and more expensive largely due to government fees. Based on what we know today we object to the adoption of this draft or final CIMP ordinance. Existing public noticing of projects should generate significant relevant comments. Your draft ordinance appears to solicit and beg unnecessary concerns and costs.

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

**Myron Crawford
cc: IJ (9)**