

Comments on Coyote Valley Specific Plan DEIR

Page xx

MM NOI-7.1

Shouldn't the reference regarding the 150-foot separation be greater rather than *less*?

Page xxiii

MM AQ-3.5 and 6.5

Last sentence is not clear, needs to be amended "...shall be determined **at during** the permit..."

General Comment

Need consistency in terminologies

- ❑ US 101 versus Highway 101, US Highway 101
- ❑ Coyote Valley Boulevard versus North/South Arterial or Coyote Creek Road.
- ❑ Caltrain versus CalTrain
- ❑ Coyote Valley Parkway versus Parkway
- ❑ Santa Teresa Boulevard versus Lakeside Drive

Page 21

High-Rise Residential

"...Neighborhood-serving commercial uses are encouraged within this designation."

Don't understand this sentence, since the areas planned for High-Rise Residential uses are planned for residential uses only, no commercial uses have been included for these area in the overall square footage of commercial.

Page 30

Figure 2.0-6

Figure is incorrect. There is **no** section of Santa Teresa Boulevard that has this configuration. Santa Teresa Boulevard is planned to front the Lake through the Core area. The street that has transit and mixed-uses is the second ring road, which has been designated as Bailey Avenue.

Page 32

Figure 2.0-8

The title to this figure is wrong, as no frontage road is shown adjacent to Coyote Valley Parkway.

Page 34

Public Services

Reference is made in first paragraph to "...Charter School) with adjoining one acre shared use open fields..."

The one-acre park adjacent to the elementary schools is planned to be a public park that is **not** shared with the school. This allows use of the park

all day without interference with school functions. This has been agreed to be the Parks Department and MHUSD.

Page 35

Flood Control and Storm Drainage Facilities

Second paragraph, last sentence.

This sentence is confusing as it references urban development included in the CVSP. Does it not mean the CVSP urban development planned within the area of CVRP only?

Page 38

Segment 3

Last paragraph

Is this statement correct? Are improvements being planned in the Greenbelt?

Page 41

Segment 2

Last sentence is incorrect, or at least incomplete. The pool at Fisher Creek would not empty into the Fisher Creek except during storm conditions. If the pool emptied into Fisher Creek it would have the effect of draining the Lake. The intent is to have water flowing through this section of the Urban Canal and then re-circulate back to the Lake from the pool adjacent to the Fisher Creek.

Page 66

Hillside Development Policies

Policy #1

Consistency: The CVSP includes the designation of lands with slopes of greater than 7% for residential uses....

There has never been any mention of developing a 7% slope line within the CVSP area. The only line has been the 15% slope line.

Page 72

Policy #33

Consistency: The proposed project would adhere to the City's parking requirement; therefore, it would be consistent with Transportation Policy #33.

This statement is contrary to the urban parking model that is proposed for the CVSP. The CVSP proposes a significant reduction in parking to ensure the urban character of Coyote Valley is realized. Meeting the City's parking requirements would require approximately 150 acres more of surface parking, which is absolutely opposite of the goal of structured parking.

Page 120

Arterials and Roadways/Local Access

Bailey Avenue

Reference is made to Bailey Avenue being four lanes from US 101 to Monterey Road. The street sections prepared by HMM show Bailey Avenue as a six-lane road to Coyote Valley Boulevard where it transitions to four lanes to the first ring road west of Coyote Valley Boulevard where it transitions to two lanes as it heads west.

Page 146

Trip Generation

The assumptions in the VTA model seem to put more projects trips to pedestrian or bikes (8%) than it does to transit (4%), which seems contrary to normal logic. This and the assumption that 86% of trips will be by automobile is contrary to the whole premise of the CVSP of creating the BRT network, Caltrain multi-modal station and an urban mixed-use urban core that is not dependent on the automobile alone.

Page 159

Impacts to Future Coyote Valley Intersections

References to street names and intersections are confusing, as names are not consistent with CVSP documents or rest of DEIR.

Page 160

Figure 4.3-15

Lakeside Drive is confusing, as it is actually Santa Teresa Boulevard. If using that street name, where does it terminate heading north?

The impacted intersection bullets do not all match the discussion on page 159. It appears the impacted intersection on Bailey Avenue closest to the Lake is located in error and should have been located two intersections to the east.

Where did the name Fisher Creek Boulevard come from?

Page 164

4.2.2.10 Parking Impacts

This discussion is inconsistent. The CVSP is based upon a reduction in the required number of parking spaces from what is typically required by the Zoning Ordinance. To say "all development would include parking in accordance with the City's Zoning Ordinance and the future CVSP Design Guidelines" is inconsistent and not accurate. The idea is to reduce the number of parking spaces required and to also provide for shared district and private parking structures to reduce the impact of seas of surface parking that reinforces more conventional suburban communities. Yes, there may be an impact, but without the new parking strategies, the area will look like everything else in San Jose.

4.2.2.11 Traffic Spillover

Second Paragraph

Are we really widening Monterey Road? Isn't it only realignment of the road in some areas? It is still proposed to be a four-lane road.

Page 166

4.2.3 Partial CVSP Conditions

After second paragraph, fourth bullet

"Full build-out of Coyote Valley Parkway (only one lane in each direction would initially be provided between the one-way couplet and Monterey Road)"

Where is this street section? Not clear.

Page 277

Impact BIO-4

How can the D EIR say there will be a **significant impact** from proposed recharge basins when they have not even been located? There are areas within the Greenbelt that are not classified as wetlands, streams or pond habitat.

Page 310

Impact BIO-22

Why not use similar language as in CR-6?

Page 370

4.10.2.4 Change in Visual Character

"....Representations of future conditions are shown on Figures 4.10-1 and 4.10-2."

This statement is grossly exaggerated, as the figures show the entire area of a land use category in perspective, not individual buildings. As an example, the High Density area around the lake may take the form of three or four relatively slender buildings versus the massive block that is shown in the figure. The figures also distort the vertical scale, while it is mentioned in the corner of the figures, it leads to misunderstanding of the actual scale of development as perceived by the general public.

Page 371

Figure 4.10-1

See comment regarding Page 370.

Page 372

Figure 4.10-2

See comment regarding Page 370.

Page 373

Second Paragraph

The discussion of BOH being proposed to be a 4-lane arterial seems misleading. My understanding is that BOH would be a split roadway as it goes over the hill. While this would be a 4-lane road, it would not have

the same impact as if it were 4-lanes contiguous lanes in width. The split roadway configuration is not mentioned. The splitting of the roadway could reduce impacts as part of the road would be the existing road and the new portion would only be 2-lanes in width.

Page 422

4.16.2.2 Groundwater Recharge in Coyote Valley Sub-basin

Second Paragraph

"...approximately 50 to 100 acres of groundwater..."

In early discussions with the Water District, Barbara Judd indicated that the District was looking at 20 acres for recharge ponds. This seems like a significant increase in acreage.

Page 427

Hazardous Materials Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Second Paragraph

Would it not be prudent to look at requiring that all diesel storage tanks be installed above ground to ensure the protection of the groundwater basin?

Page 447

5.4.1.8 Other Impacts (Page 446)

Fourth line of beginning paragraph

"...on the east side of Coyote Creek, thereby..."

Shouldn't it be Monterey Road versus Coyote Creek?

Page 474

Impact C-TRAN-3

The first sentence is not a complete statement.