



Summary of Community Engagement Input on Levi's Stadium

May 2018

Background

In December 2017, the City of Santa Clara and the Santa Clara Stadium Authority launched a transparent, independent and comprehensive engagement process to hear the community's views on a variety of issues related to Levi's Stadium. The primary purpose of this engagement process was to independently identify the most important issues for Santa Clara residents, and offer policy recommendations to the Stadium Authority Board for addressing these issues. The Lew Edwards Group was hired to coordinate overall efforts related to this project, including gathering statistically valid public views through opinion partner EMC Research. The Public Dialogue Consortium was hired to facilitate meaningful, robust, qualitative input from individuals, groups and organizations. This report is a summary of the qualitative input gathered by PDC during its community outreach and engagement process.

Engagement Events and Outreach

A number of engagement events were conducted to elicit input from community members. Outreach to participate in these events was conducted via personal emails, City website, Facebook, Twitter, Nextdoor, print news, and flyers handed out at events and posted in libraries, community centers, coffee shops and shopping centers.

Here are the specific engagement events conducted:

- Community Interviews with all Stadium Authority Board members were conducted in January 2018, and in March 159 people were interviewed at the Santa Clara farmer's market and at Levi's Stadium during a soccer event.
- Invitations to participate in Focus Groups went out to a wide variety of individuals and stakeholder groups in Santa Clara, resulting in six focus groups with a total of forty-one participants during March and April 2018.
- An Online Questionnaire was initiated to invite broad participation, with the content mirroring the questions asked during interviews and focus groups. Input was gathered from 231 participants between February and May 2018.

- Three Community Meetings were held in late April and early May to invite participants to review input gathered in the previous phases of engagement, and to consider recommendations and solutions, resulting in policy recommendations for City Council and the Stadium Authority. Only twenty-three Santa Clara residents participated in the three community meetings, some of whom had participated in previous focus groups, suggesting a "saturation point" in the community on this topic.

Over 400 people participated in one or more of the community engagement events. See Appendix A for a summary of focus groups and community meeting dates, times and locations. Appendix B provides a demographic summary of the participants.

Questions Asked: Phases 1 & 2

All questions asked were open-ended, enabling participants to express views and perspectives in their own words and from their own perspectives. The following questions from Phase 1 focused on people's concerns and appreciations for Levi's Stadium.

1. When you think of Levi's stadium, what words come to mind?
2. It sounds like you have some concerns. What are your concerns with the Stadium?
3. It sounds like you have some favorable views. What do you like about Levi's Stadium?
4. What is your overall opinion of the Stadium? (concerned, supportive mixed)
5. What do you say to people who have concerns about the stadium? How should their concerns be addressed?
6. What do you say to people who are more supportive of the stadium? How can we acknowledge their support while addressing your concerns?

After collecting responses to the questions above, a second phase of questions was posed to participants to elicit recommendations. These questions were:

1. What suggestions, ideas or recommendations do you have to address and resolve the concerns you have identified?
2. What suggestions, ideas or recommendations do you have to build on and extend the positive features you have identified?

Key Issues & Recommendations

Below are the key issues that emerged through the engagement process, along with recommendations for how best to improve upon these issues to increase the overall quality of experience as it relates to Levi's Stadium. These issues and recommendations are organized into themes that relate to the most commonly identified concerns and likes.

The issues and recommendations are attributed to three different categories of participants who responded during the community engagement efforts: Santa Clara Residents who live outside of

the Levi's Stadium impact area, Santa Clara Residents who live within the Levi's Stadium impact area in the north side (i.e. near neighbors), and those who live outside of Santa Clara. These three groupings of participants have different experiences and views of the Stadium, with the near neighbors clearly expressing more concerns than the other two participant groups. However, there was some overlap between Santa Clara residents who live outside and inside the Stadium impact area in terms of expressing concerns with Trust, Transparency, and Communication (and to a lesser extent, Traffic). Moreover, the vast majority of Santa Clara residents, both inside and outside the impact area, agree that the Stadium is here to stay and open communication and productive problem solving is needed in order to maximize its assets while minimizing negative impacts.

Trust, Transparency & Communication

The issues of trust, transparency and communication are of concern to many Santa Clara residents who engaged in this process, regardless of where they live, although the level of intensity is most acute for the near neighbors. Regardless, many participants say that a lack of trust has developed between the City, community, and Stadium Management Company, mostly due to the lack of financial transparency and follow through on initial commitments and agreements made when voters approved the Stadium via Measure J. Many residents say financial transparency is imperative so taxpayers understand the financial tradeoffs of Stadium events and can better understand the value of Stadium revenue to the City. Some residents are concerned that the City is increasing cost concessions to the Stadium, without holding the Stadium to their initial agreements. Santa Clara residents are concerned about the toll the lack of trust and transparency is taking on their community, both financially and socially.

Recommendations

Repair Trust by Establishing Financial Transparency

1. ***Establish financial transparency and share financial data*** as it relates to income and expenses directly associated with the Stadium, return on investment, and profit sharing with Santa Clara residents.
 - a. Report on how many jobs have been created by the Stadium, as well as residual revenue generated for Santa Clara businesses.
2. ***Clarify costs*** to Santa Clara tax payers of what portion of Stadium costs are paid for by whom, including costs of security, enforcement and infrastructure.

Repair Trust by Improving Communication

3. ***Establish ongoing, two-way communication forums*** for residents to communicate with those in charge of making decisions for Levi's Stadium. Establish an open dialogue to allow for ongoing conversation, feedback, and problem solving.

- a. Institute a Levi's Stadium Advisory Committee that meets regularly with Stadium Authority, the Stadium Management Company, and the 49ers, allowing residents to give input on policies and decisions.
 - b. Establish a way to update residents of rules, plans, visions and decisions, i.e. a newsletter or email update.
4. ***Set up a notification system*** that notifies resident of Stadium events and concerns, traffic and parking flows and alternatives, fireworks, etc. Include periodic updates in a newsletter format.
 5. ***Set up a hotline*** for people to call with safety concerns and complaints that is available during events with quick response times - run by either the Stadium, Police, or City.

Provide Neighborhood Improvements and Benefits

6. ***Allocate revenue to enhance the quality of life*** for near neighbors and tax payers.
 - a. Earmark revenue to improve the quality of life by making neighborhood improvements (e.g. repair sidewalks, improvements to Lick ill park, etc.).
 - b. Increase revenue and awareness of revenue for schools and libraries.
7. ***Offer lower cost access*** to the Stadium to Santa Clara community members.
 - a. Offer low price ticket options and presale access to local neighbors and the community.
 - b. Create an affordable package for local community and non-profit organizations who want to rent meeting and event space.
8. ***Offer space for community events*** throughout the year.
 - a. Hold an open house type event to help the community understand more about the venue. Have 49ers players attend to and connect with the community.
 - b. Offer space for science fairs, stem fairs, etc.
 - c. Allow a Viva Calle where space surrounding the Stadium is set up with vendors and artisans.
 - d. Open parking lots for flea market, artisan space, etc. during times when there are no Stadium events.

Parking & Traffic

Parking and traffic issues are another major concern, with both being prominent for near neighbors, and traffic impacts being singled out by other participants as well, regardless of where they live. Many point out that it is not just the Stadium that is contributing to traffic and parking problems, but also Great America, the Convention Center, the airport, and new development projects. Many participants are concerned about City Place and other large retail and residential developments in the area, saying they will contribute to the overall problems of increased traffic, noise, the need for more parking, and the erosion of their overall quality of life.

Neighbors of the Stadium indicate they are unable to leave and/or return to their homes easily on event days, with significant increases in commute times. At times they are blocked into their driveways, or others have parked in their driveways.

The closure of the San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail during events is a concern for bikers and pedestrians. The trail is cited as a needed alternative to driving, as well as being a public trail that needs to remain accessible to the community at all times. Detours through parking areas are seen as unsafe to all, especially those with accessibility concerns.

Most participants agree that easy to implement, low cost solutions are most desirable as a starting point, and that long term, holistic planning is needed to address long term infrastructure needs related to traffic, parking and planned development.

Recommendations

Address Parking Concerns with Permits and Enforcement

9. ***Institute permit parking*** only on Stadium event days for neighboring streets. Issue affordable parking permits to residents, including guest parking passes.
10. ***Enforce parking restrictions*** by ticketing and towing all non-resident parking during events.
 - a. Add Agnew and Lafayette streets to the list of streets closed for Stadium parking.
11. ***Station guards at roadblocks past event start times*** as those looking for parking ignore and go around roadblocks when left unguarded.
 - a. Train parking and security guards to stand outside of their cars to increase enforcement of roadblocks.
12. ***Employ motorcycle and/or bicycle officers*** to be able to respond more easily to parking and security concerns, while increasing the security staff at events.

Address Traffic Concerns with Alternatives and Improvements

13. ***Establish a shuttle service from parking lots*** further from the Stadium.
14. ***Designate a rideshare area*** to easily drop off and pick up passengers.
 - a. Extend Uber partnership to Lyft and other transportation services.
15. ***Reconfigure traffic flows and build pedestrian overpasses.*** The light rail, pedestrian crossings and cars all need to stop for each other at certain intersections, contributing to congestion.
 - a. ***Build pedestrian and bicycle overpasses*** to ease congestion and contribute to safety.
 - b. Open up the south east corner of Levi's Stadium to alleviate dangers to pedestrian traffic on Tasman.
 - c. Install a three-way stop at Mercado 20 shopping center entrance.
16. ***Avoid closure of the San Tomas Trail*** and encourage its use to decrease traffic.

- a. Move the magnetometers and portable traffic signs so they do not block the trail.
 - i. Alternately, put temporary holes in the fencing along the trail and have everyone on the trail go through security.
 - ii. Alternately, detour the trail down to river level during events to avoid closure.
- 17. ***Invest in more signage*** to indicate parking and road closures.
 - a. Install permanent parking signs so temporary signs can be removed from the San Tomas trail.
 - b. Indicate where there is bike parking and security for events.
- 18. ***Devise a clear system and training*** of law enforcement so residents with red stickers are allowed to easily turn onto blocked neighborhood streets on event days.
- 19. ***Consider scheduled events in the area holistically*** when scheduling Stadium events.

Incentivize and Expand Public Transportation

- 20. ***Offer incentives for public transit***, such as free VTA light rail on event days.
 - a. Add a tax to parking or event tickets that generate revenue and incentives to encourage people not to drive and to offset public transportation costs.
- 21. ***Coordinate with VTA*** to ensure public transit is running after events as sometimes people have been left stranded after events.
- 22. ***Improve VTA*** light rail to make it faster and more efficient by introducing express routes with no stops and increasing capacity.
- 23. ***Add remote parking lots with VTA transit*** options east of the Stadium.
- 24. ***Establish an inter-department, inter-agency task force*** to address public transportation and other issues and infrastructure needs for long term planning.

Safety, Security & Noise

Many Santa Clara residents and almost all near neighbors expressed the need for better security and police patrol during events, citing unmanaged crowds and safety concerns, as well as noise disturbances. Neighbors close to the Stadium frequently cited security concerns ranging from littering and vandalism to loud and raucous behavior, public consumption of alcohol and drugs, drunk driving, and public urination.

Neighbors living close to the Stadium frequently cite noise concerns, including high decibel levels generated by the Stadium, ongoing air traffic during and after Stadium events, and noise from attendees walking through neighborhoods after events. Air and foot traffic noise last for hours after a Stadium event ends.

Recommendations

Invest in Neighborhood Safety and Security

- 25. ***Increase patrol before and after events*** in neighborhoods near the Stadium.

- a. Employ motorcycle cops to be able to respond more easily to parking and security concerns.
 - b. Train security and traffic officers to interact with the neighbors more effectively.
 - c. Increase police presence in Mission Park.
 - d. Structure event permitting to pay for increased neighborhood security.
26. **Add more public bathrooms** to decrease public urination.
- a. Increase portable bathrooms in the parking lots.
 - b. Construct and maintain a bathroom in Fairway Glen Park.
27. **Add more trash cans** and pass around trash bags during game to minimize litter.
28. **Employ staff to pick-up litter** along the creek, trails and in neighborhoods after events.

Recommendations

Take Noise Control Measures

29. **Levy heavier fines** for noise and curfew violations.
30. **Institute stricter noise control measures.**
- a. Place new controls on the decibel level allowed, instituting and enforcing a permanent noise monitoring system.
 - b. Legislate stricter air traffic control restrictions to control late night fly over noise.
 - c. Require the Stadium to institute noise control measures such as a sound wall and directional speakers to redirect and dampen the noise for nearby neighbors.
 - i. Combine a sound wall with a shade structure if possible to protect event-goers during hot and sunny days.
 - d. Enforce the current weekday and weekend curfews; do not extend them; revisit the curfew to consider that the noise goes hours past the time the events end.
 - e. Patrol residential streets after events to deter noise from those walking through the neighborhoods.
31. **Set up a program for nearby neighbors** who are most impacted by the noise to compensate for the installation of thicker windows, insulation and air conditioners.

Economic & Entertainment Benefits to the City

Almost all of those who supported Levi's Stadium said that they appreciated having a top-tier entertainment venue in Santa Clara, as well as a facility that can bring revenue, jobs and economic development to the City. A major concern among these participants is that the Stadium is not being utilized to its fullest extent, and therefore is not maximizing the potential range of benefits possible, particularly in terms of revenue generation. They state that the caliber, size and expense of the Stadium justify adding events and extending curfews, including for carefully selected weeknight events.

Recommendations

Expand Events and Extend Curfew

32. *Increase the number of events, as reasonable.*
33. *Schedule weekend events* whenever possible.
34. *Selectively extend the curfew* to 11pm on weeknights and to midnight on weekends.
 - a. Increase the amount of times the stadium is allowed to host past 10pm (e.g. from four to ten times a year).
 - b. Charge extra for permitting to mitigate noise concerns for near neighbors.
 - c. Select extended curfew events carefully, with consideration of school and work schedules.

In many ways, these recommendations point to the fundamental tension that the Stadium Board Authority will need to manage as they develop policy options for the Stadium: How to maximize the benefits of the Stadium for Santa Clara, while minimizing (i.e. maintaining, improving) the negative impacts to the near neighbors and the rest of the City.

Strategic Guideline for Policy Options

We offer these concluding observations to suggest a strategic guideline for the Stadium Authority Board to consider as they respond to the issues and recommendations and develop policy options.

1. *The energy and passion is primarily with those who have concerns about the Stadium.*

It became clear as we talked with participants that the people who expressed mostly concerns about the Stadium have more to say, and are more animated and passionate than those who expressed mostly appreciations and support. This observation is not meant as an evaluative statement about the validity of the concerns and appreciations we heard. However, it does point to the need to address those Santa Clara residents who have strong concerns about the Stadium because the intensity and depth of their views are not likely to dissipate easily or quickly. The energy and passion is with those who have concerns, even though, overall, they are fewer in number than those who do not have concerns.

There is also some energy and passion from those who support the Stadium, but it is muted compared to those who voice concerns. Nevertheless, the passion on the support side comes from wanting to maximize the potential benefits of the Stadium for the City. From this perspective, the Stadium Authority Board should be working to utilize the Stadium as much as possible to provide economic benefits to the City, which is the basis for the recommendations to increase events and extent the curfew.

2. *There is support from most Santa Clara residents for the near neighbors.* One of the more heartening findings from this engagement process is the way in which most of the Santa Clara residents who do not live near the Stadium support those who do. Even

participants who strongly support the Stadium recognize that there are negative impacts to the near neighbors, and they would like to see those impacts addressed. Put differently, most of the Stadium supporters we talked with are aware that their recommendations to increase events and extend the curfew will increase the negative impacts to the near neighbors, and they want those impacts to be lessened, reduced, or eliminated.

3. *This leads to a strategic guideline for the Stadium Authority Board to consider:*

Explore policy options to increase events and extend the curfew, but only while pursuing policy options to resolve, minimize, or mitigate the Trust/Transparency/Communication, Parking/Traffic, and Safety/Security/Noise issues.

Appendix A: Focus Groups & Community Meetings

1. Focus Group with Engaged Community Members, March 19, 2018, 6:00 - 7:30 p.m., Santa Clara City Hall Cafeteria, 1500 Warburton Ave, Santa Clara, CA
2. Focus Group with Engaged Community Members, March 21, 2018, 6:00 - 7:30 p.m., Santa Clara City Hall Cafeteria, 1500 Warburton Ave, Santa Clara, CA
3. Focus Group with Great America, March 28, 2018, 10:00 - 11:00 a.m., Great America Administrative Offices, Santa Clara, CA
4. Focus Group with Northside Neighbors, April 2, 2018, 5:00 - 6:30 p.m., Northside Library, Santa Clara, 695 Moreland Way, CA
5. Focus Group with Northside Neighbors, April 2, 2018, 7:00 - 8:30 p.m., Northside Library, Santa Clara, 695 Moreland Way, CA
6. Focus Group with Chamber of Commerce, April 13, 2018, 11:00 a.m. - 12 p.m., Chamber of Commerce Offices, 1850 Warburton Ave, Santa Clara, CA
7. Community Meeting at Central Park Library Redwood Room, April 26, 2018 6:00 - 8:00 p.m., 2635 Homestead Ave, Santa Clara, CA 95050
8. Community Meeting at Santa Clara Community Recreation Center, April 28, 2018, 6:00 - 8:00 p.m., 969 Kiely Boulevard, Santa Clara, CA 95051
9. Community Meeting at Northside Library Community Room, May 9, 2018, 6:00 - 8:00 p.m., 695 Moreland Way, Santa Clara, CA 95054

Appendix B: Demographics of Levi's Stadium Community Engagement Participants

		Focus Groups & Public Meetings	Stadium & Farmers Market Interviews	Online Participation	Totals (%)
Zip Code	Near Stadium 95054	36	5	102	143 = 32%
	Santa Clara	15	44	123	182 = 41%
	Other	1	110	6	117 = 27%
	Totals	52	159	231	442
Gender	Male	23	104	113	240 = 54%
	Female	28	54	100	182 = 41%
	Prefer not to say	1	1	18	20 = 5%
	Totals	52	159	231	442
Age	Under 18	0	10	0	10 = 2%
	18-30	1	41	11	53 = 12%
	31-40	10	55	35	100 = 23%
	41-55	14	29	90	133 = 30%
	Above 55	27	23	85	135 = 31%
	Prefer not to say	0	1	10	11 = 2%
	Totals	52	159	231	442
Ethnicity	White	23	49	116	188 = 42.5%
	Hispanic	7	85	7	99 = 22%
	Indian	4	9	20	33 = 7.5%
	Filipino	5	1	10	16 = 3.5%
	Chinese	0	2	11	13 = 3%
	African American	2	2	3	7 = 2%
	Vietnamese	1	0	3	4 = 1%
	Korean	2	1	1	4 = 1%
	Japanese	2	1	1	4 = 1%
	Native American	1	0	1	2 = .5%
	Pacific Islander	2	0	0	2 = .5%
	Mixed Ethnicity	3	7	10	20 = 4.5%
	Prefer not to say	0	2	48	50 = 11%
	Totals	52	159	231	442