

(Taken directly from the transcript as provided by the meeting archive of the city of San Jose website)

>> Councilmember Constant,

>> Thank you, mayor. There is no doubt in my mind this area of the city is deserving of a designation in becoming a business district. How far, i'm troubled by the division of the community that's occurring as a result of it. I'm a little troubled with the process. I think in order for a name of an area to take hold and to really be successful and have community ownership is does need to be small organic and perkulating up from the community versus being designated necessarily by the city. I understand the mayor and vice mayor and madison nguyen's comments on how we will make a designation and chose a name they wish to be called by. If that is something we should like to do we should pick a name that is not indicative of picking oner the other. I understand the saigon business district is being compromised this is not a new compromise this was on the original ballot and voted or not voted for in almost every measure I had been that has been available to me that has been pretty much at the bottom of the list. I think that's something we cannot ignore. If we want to do the best for the community we should be looking at designating a very simple name like the center road business district and see which of the variations of saigon naming ends up being embraced by the community. If you think of the neighborhoods in each district. I'm sure we can all think of one or 2 or 3 in our district you would be hard pressed todd go in district and say we will change the name to x, y or z. Using a commercial example I still refer to candle stick park no matter if te's monster or other name those who have history will refer to it as the organic name that it's known. We, as a government also need to be conscious of the promises that we make and to community and if we go out and say that we are going to use this process or that process to guide us down a path I think we have an obligation to stick by that process. I know that the community was told very clearly in community meetings that the rda survey was going to be what lead the decision making. Yet, it's clear to me that's not what's happening tonight. I would love to support the motion as it is I don't think I can. It's not in the spirit of what the community was told of how the process would go forward. I don't believe that it honors the input of the community. Not only here today have we heard strongly of the support for a name other than the name designated. The support is similar in e mail, voice mail, regular mail pnl contacts plus a handful of different surveys I have seen by the redevelopment agency and the mercury news. I can't support the motion the way it is because I don't feel it's the best thing for the community as a whole. And ask my colleagues to consider if we will insist on giving it a name now we pick center road something that we can then allow the community to take ownership of. To develop and do all the things the vice mayor mentioned that can be done with a generic name without giving a predeposition to one. I ask you to consider that. And I would make it as a friendly amendment to see if it would be taken to see if we accept the staff recommendations in 1 a and b. Except in number 2 to change the name to be something similar to the center road business district until such time as the community takes ownership and another name perkulates up.

>> councilmember nguyen.

>> councilmember constant I appreciate your comments. In a way I do agree with you to a certain extent. The community has been through this process for the last 9 months. My office has been receiving e mails and phone calls with different suggestions of the name. Coming to this decision has been difficult. I think that the compromised name is best in this issue.

>> it's okay.

>> councilmember constant. Thank you for consider it unfortunately I don't think I will be able to supportow this because of the reasons I have expressed. And again, I have difficulty in accepting this as a compromise when it was on the ballot and in the different surveys and I don't see it that we i'm sorry I can't see things that way. Thank you.

>>councilmember Chu,

>> I think that's very, very important you know that's given that business district an official name. I have attended a forum or a hearing on this issue at a high school was packed with passionate people and wanted little saigon. Af that meeting I went back to my office and did a survey of my own. And calling the people in district 4 and the result also has high percentage of support for little saigon. I think little saigon the fact that we have it in so many different cities and in the california has branding a name recognition there. And also hopefully will connect the vietnamese community from outside of the san jose all together. I would support little saigon. And -- I don't know if madison will take a compromise to add little to the saigon business district? [applause].

>> councilmember chu. I respect your comments but we worked hard to come up with this compromise. I want to address how the business district was not a compromise. There are 6 names on the survey. 70 percent of the community wanted saigon and when I say that I mean there are 6 name Vietnamese american business districts. Saigon town, new saigon and saigon business district. I memorized the name because you imagine how entrenched I am with this much in those name see saigon. In the 6 names what we saw was the name saigon. I apologize I can't accept the friendly amendment. Thank you.

>> all right.

>> councilmember oliverio. I want to compliment madison nguyen. You are an advocate for the vietnamese community and for the latin american community as you did with your new prototype. I'm proud to serve with you. I want to thaveng the people who came out here sitting around and watching this debate here. I took time and walked through the people there was young and old there were immigrants and people that have been here for decades. I voted in june. To support the out reach to start this process with the redevelopment upon agency because I like signs. I think signs are a symbolism. In my travel I see them all over. I think it out lineses what we have the potential to be. San jose has multiple ethnicities. With that said, there are many of those communities in the

subgroups that love to have something named for them. Proud to be united on something. To celebrate the idea of democracy. Sunday I drove to story road visual what the district would look like. I drove past 101 and drove to the strong neighborhoods. I kept driving because I got the time. I wanted to continue venturing around. As a councilmember we focus on our own district and forget about our whole city. San Jose is a jigsaw pez you will. We need to help this city and pull it up. That's why we have strong neighborhood initiatives. If i'm asked to spend money of redevelopment money and i'm asked to spend it tonight on a naming of the vietnamese business district or putting into the strong neighborhood initiatives. That's a question for me as a policy maker. I saw we still have a lot to do. I'm in a resource constrained economic budget. I can help the residents in district 5 and 8 or I can do the signs. **I don't see the sign to be a unifier don't. I can't spend the money on the signs if the community is not happy with it.** I would rather put the money in the neighborhood it is where people want something accomplished. **I cannot support the motion this evening. If somebody said, do you want to name the district I would but I can't do it if it's a divisive thing. I say dui moon saigon. I support little saigon.** I completely am totally respectful of councilmember nguyen. She's a great colleague and she has the convictions you want. You might disagree with you tonight she has the convictions you want to represent you. For tonight I got a view again do I spend the money on sign or not bringing the community together or spend it to manage the strong things the strong neighborhoods does. I will not support the motion this evening.

>> councilmember Constant: I will be brief. **Back in june we voted as a council to do out reach. And did out reach. And the memo that's presented tonight was did last in the out reach. If we are going to make out reach in the city meaningful we need to consider the response that we get. We have to remember that public meetings are meant for public discussion. And decisionmaking. If we come so the meetings with our minds made up and don't listen to the public I don't think we are doing our jobs. It's mentioned a couple of times here that we are a democracy and representative republic and we are truly a represent republic and need to representative what the public things. I will repeat this every survey I have seen including our own has said that little saigon is the preferred choice. It was clear today we heard the same thing. I think we should not ignore that. I would like to make a motion for an amendment to change the name to little saigon. [applause]. I will second the motion.**

>> Motion is to substitute motion made by councilmember constant seconded by councilmember chu to change to little saigon. All in favor? Opposed. That motion fails 8-3 vote.