

City of San José
Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Task Force Meeting
January 22, 2007
City Hall, Committee Rooms W118-120

Task Force Members Present

Co-Chair Councilmember Forrest Williams, Co-Chair Councilmember Nancy Pyle, Chuck Butters, Eric Carruthers, Helen Chapman, Pat Dando, Gladwyn D'Souza, Russ Danielson, Craige Edgerton, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Supervisor Don Gage, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Chris Platten, Ken Saso, Steve Schott, Jr, and Steve Speno.

Task Force Members Absent

Melissa Hippard, and Neil Struthers.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present

Shanna Boigon (Santa Clara County Association of Realtors), Dawn Cameron (Consultant with County Roads), Mike Griffis (Santa Clara County Roads), Libby Lucas (CA Native Plan Society), Pamela Vasudeva (Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority), Tim Steele (Sobrato), Sarah Muller (Working Partnerships), Bonnie Tognazzini (Morgan Hill Unified School District) and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present

Councilmember Pete Constant (Council District 1), Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), Jessica Garcia-Kohl (Council District 3), Colleen Valles (Office of Supervisor Don Gage), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Stan Ketchum (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Stefanie Hom (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Maria Angeles (Public Works), Walter Lin (ESD), and Dave Mitchell (PRNS).

Consultants Present

Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), and Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies).

Community Members Present (Additional people were present; however, the names below only reflect individuals who identified themselves on the sign-up sheet.)

Tom Armstrong, Ali Abdollahi, Pete Benson, Mike Biggar, Roger Costa, Frank Crane, Myron Crawford, Todd Costa, Robert Eltgrogh, Michael Greene, Loren Gundersen, Russ Gatschet, Virginia Holtz, Joel Jimenez, Jack Kuzia, Preethi Krishnan, Yoon Lee, Peter Mandel, Daniel Olstein, Georgene Petri, Maralee Potter, George Reily, Peter Rothschild, Art Sanchez, Annie Saso, Pauline Seebach, Pete Silva, Sharon Simonson, Marley Spilman, George Thomas, Jr., Shelle Thomas, David Tymn, Al Victors, Prabha Venu, and Don Weden.

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at approximately 5:30 p.m. with Co-Chair Councilmember Forrest Williams welcoming everyone to the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meeting.

2. Acceptance of November 13, 2006 Task Force Meeting Summary

Co-chair Councilmember Nancy Pyle called for a motion to accept the November 13, 2006 Task Force meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Acceptance of the December 11, 2006 Task Force Meeting Summary

Co-chair Councilmember Nancy Pyle called for a motion to accept the December 11, 2006 Task Force meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion/Comments on the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, indicated that staff has a series of questions to guide the Task Force in their discussion of the Initial Draft Specific Plan.

Laurel introduced Stan Ketchum, Principal Planner with the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement. Stan will be working with the Coyote Valley Specific Plan team while Sal Yakubu is on leave.

The following questions were presented to the Task Force for discussion:

Question 1: What are your first impressions of the Initial Draft Specific Plan document? How effective are the format and graphics? Is the text clear and understandable?

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments (Please note that comments are

shown first, followed by responses in italics):

- The document is well done. There is a lot of information.
- The Plan still needs to go through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Then there may be modifications to the Plan.
- Is the lake still planned in Coyote Valley? The Plan should be more flexible to accommodate changes and allow all workplace users and all floor area ratios (FARs).
- The graphics and explanations are good.
- The policies fit with the scope of work proposed.
- There are variations between the Planning Area Detail Appendix and the Initial Draft Specific Plan. The Planning Area Detail Appendix should be summarized in the Initial Draft. *Laurel indicated that the Initial Draft Specific Plan does not preclude the Planning Area Detail Appendix. The Initial Draft is intended to align with the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); there will be additional Plan refinements after the draft EIR is released.*
- There are existing zoning designations in Coyote Valley. If those existing zoning approvals are implemented prior to the adoption of the Plan, the Plan may need to be revised to accommodate that.
- There needs to be a fiscal and phasing analysis to explain how the Plan is going to unfold. *Laurel indicated there will be more information on the finance and phasing analysis after the release of the EIR.*
- Sections 4 and 6, and objective 23 are good, and overall the Plan is clear and concise. The Elements of Sustainability are not clear or well laid out, and they should be clarified. Objective 23 in Chapter 4 should also take into consideration long term sustainability. Needs to be accommodated in footprint. Section 23 needs to accommodate land uses so sustainable transportation is viable within the City.
- The Plan should be flexible. Should indicate average densities, especially in the campus industrial areas.
- Would a project be denied if it proposes excess parking spaces? *Laurel indicated the Plan will be flexible while meeting all of the City Council Vision and Expected Outcomes. There may be options for shared parking. But limiting parking is important in encouraging people to ride transit.*
- Would like to find creative ways to solve concerns of corporate users, rather than denying a project because it does not fit with the Plan. *The City would work with large corporate users to find a solution.*
- Is there going to be an update on infrastructure costs? Is an infrastructure phasing plan going to be incorporated into the Plan? *Laurel indicated infrastructure costs would be updated soon.*
- The Plan looks beautiful.
- The Plan has a great vision, but would like to know what is realistic.
- Would like more information on jobs, such as the types of jobs that would be permitted and the quality of jobs.
- Some topics are not addressed in detail, such as child care and health care. Would these issues be explained elsewhere?
- There should be a cost analysis on government facilities.
- There should be more information on how the CVSP would contribute to the City of San

Jose as a whole.

- The proposed parking ratio of 2:1 is unrealistic in the initial phases for Coyote Valley.
- The document is manageable and the glossary is useful.
- Some sections are laid out more thoroughly than other sections.
- The Plan should be clear enough for the entire City to understand.
- The Plan would grow and evolve over time. The vision and information on economic development should be updated accordingly to stay current.
- Suggested adding another section to the Plan on flexibility on restrictions for businesses.
- Suggested that the Plan include a 40 – 50 year timeline for the build-out of Coyote Valley.
- Pleased to see that not much jargon is used in the document; it should be written in readable language.
- The City should not sacrifice the overall goals of the Plan to large corporate users.
- The graphic layout of the vision should be improved and emphasized.
- Would housing pay for the jobs? *Laurel indicated that there has been no decision on the phasing and of the Plan yet.*
- Impressed with the Plan.
- Would like the discussion questions in advance to allow time to think about them before the discussion.
- There should be more information in the Plan about groundwater quality and protection. The Plan does not emphasize that groundwater protection is a critical goal.

Question 2: How effectively is the Plan responding to the “environmental footprint” analysis? How well does the Plan accomplish the Guiding Principles of environmental stewardship, open space preservation and sustainability?

- If costs increase, what overriding principles would remain and what would be cut back? *Laurel indicated that those topics would be part of the financing and phasing discussions.*
- Costs will always go up so we should look at costs and benefits. Sometimes cutting back is more detrimental.
- The Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is in the process of making a policy requiring 1 acre of mitigation for the loss of 1 acre of prime agricultural land. This requirement assumes there is a lot of mitigated land in the Greenbelt. The amount of money set aside for the Greenbelt is not sufficient for the Plan; it was a placeholder and should be updated.
- The Plan calls for protection for hillsides in the Santa Cruz mountain range and the Diablo mountain range. It is assumed that funding will be from the Santa Clara Open Space Authority, but that is not realistic. There needs to be other funding sources.
- Pleased to see an implementation program for the Greenbelt in the Plan.

Question 3: How can we improve the integration of workplace land uses throughout the Plan? Is there an adequate amount of workplace land use in the Plan? (the existing General Plan calls for about 1,400 acres of Campus Industrial land use in the north portion of Coyote Valley to accommodate 50,000 jobs, whereas the CVSP calls for 564 acres in a range of workplace intensities, together with some workplace uses in the mixed use areas).

- Can Coyote Valley be built-out with 2 parking spaces per 1000 square feet?
- May need higher parking ratios initially until there is more infrastructure in place.
- Two parking spaces per 1000 square feet may work over time, but not at the early phases.
- The General Plan currently designates Coyote Valley for campus industrial uses. The FARs were generated from Tandem and Apple's plans back in the 1970's. There was an average FAR of about .30 in all of Coyote Valley, which is very low. The minimum FAR in Coyote Valley should be .45 to .50. We need to be careful because some of the designations in the Plan have FARs that are too low for Coyote Valley. Overall, there is sufficient acreage to accommodate the 50,000 jobs, but the FARs should be more flexible.
- Need an infrastructure amenity package early on to encourage workplace users to come.
- Should contact big workplace users such as IBM and Divco as to whether the Plan is workable for them.
- There should be flexibility in the FARs in the Core.
- What is the goal of the discussion questions? *Laurel indicated the questions are intended to stimulate discussion on the Plan.*
- There should be agricultural mitigation studies on the urban part of Coyote Valley that would fund Greenbelt activities. The developer could pay a one time fee instead of an up-front fee to support the Greenbelt strategy.
- The Greenbelt area is a depressed area, and it is not a good farming area.
- Need the support of property owners to make it a good farmland area.

Question 4: How can we improve pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation and connectivity between land uses, neighborhoods and civic and community uses? (Especially along the parkway and between the east and west sides of Monterey Road).

- More priority should be given to pedestrian and bicycle mobility.
- Suggested looking at golf carts as a mobility mode.
- The mobility section is good.
- The Plan assumes that everyone that would work in Coyote Valley would live there. If everyone does not live in Coyote Valley, there is not enough parking. *Laurel indicated that the Plan anticipates a lot of shared parking and a 2:1 jobs/housing ratio, so there would be people commuting into Coyote Valley.*
- The Plan needs to be flexible enough to accommodate commuters.
- May be difficult to get banks to finance two parking spaces per 1000 square feet.
- How are people going to access Coyote Valley before transit infrastructure is in place? How does the Plan's infrastructure requirements coordinate with the infrastructure that already exists in the City?

Question 5: Past Task Force discussions have suggested that the Plan's land use designations should be "more flexible." We would appreciate additional elaboration from the Task Force on this idea. How can we make the CVSP land use designations more flexible while still meeting the City Council Vision and Expected Outcomes and our "smart growth" objectives? (e.g. consolidating/reducing land use designations with minimum densities and FARs etc.).

- Is there a history of how to maintain flexibility in a plan over time? *Laurel indicated the*

City has done several Specific Plans in the past. She asked the Task Force for their suggestions as to how to keep the Plan flexible over time.

- What are we willing to give-up to reach our goals in Coyote Valley?
- The designation of 564 acres at .50 - .55 FARs will provide 50,000 jobs.
- Suggested starting at a range of .40 - .70 FARs, then increasing to .80 – 1.5 FAR over time.
- Need flexible parking requirements to stay competitive. Suggested phasing implementation for parking. Parking ratios can be reduced gradually once transit is in place.
- Suggested a text amendment to provide density averages relative to land use colors on particular parcels.
- The structured parking goal should be 2 to 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet. The Plan could start with 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet, and then transition into shared parking in the future. Suggested looking at San Jose Downtown parking reduction strategies as a guideline for the Coyote Core.
- Suggested having parking triggers as certain development occurs.
- There are too many parcels and colors on the Plan. The parcels should not be divided up into so many land use designations.
- The Plan should provide general goals, and not be too prescriptive.
- The goal of the Plan is to meet the City Council Vision and Expected Outcomes. The 50,000 jobs and 25,000 housing units are minimums.
- There are no plans for the Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA) to provide additional services in Coyote Valley. There is not enough funding for the transit expansion. There should be high densities to support transit if there is no additional funding.
- When the development process starts, there should be an infrastructure plan. Costs may be high if one business needs to provide all infrastructure. *Laurel indicated that additional information will be provided in the financing analysis for phasing.*
- Some companies have existing entitlements and approved permits in North Coyote Valley. What does that do to the Plan?
- The acronyms in the Plan should be clarified.

Question 6: How can we celebrate and commemorate the Coyote Valley’s agricultural and cultural heritage in the Plan? What should the “vision” for the Hamlet be?

- The Plan should indicate what is currently happening with the agricultural lands in Coyote Valley, and then integrate it into the Plan.
- Suggested having a separate entity to manage agriculture land.
- If programs for the agriculture lands are publicly funded, there should be as much information as possible to help the programs be successful.

The Task Force provided the following general comments and questions:

- Would the Task Force get to review the Plan refinements? *Laurel indicated there would be Plan refinements after the release of the Draft EIR. Staff will continue to work with the Task Force and keep them updated.*
- Would like to keep updated with the changes in the Plan. Does not want to see Plan refinements that do not show progress.

5. Public Comments

- Al Victors, representing the Foster/Benson property, indicated that the Plan should maintain flexibility. The original plan was more general, but now it is too detailed. The Plan should allow for different land uses, even if it is not designated on the map.
- Peter Mandel, President of the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD), had several concerns with the Plan regarding the proposed high school: 1) the Plan should have a land banking feature for an additional high school site to accommodate student growth, 2) the district would like two separate high school campuses in Coyote Valley, 3) would like to see a funding model for the construction of the schools, and 4) there should be a mitigation agreement adopted for the Plan.
- Bonnie Tognazzini, Deputy Superintendent of the Morgan Hill Unified School District, indicated that the Plan should designate a total of 80 acres for two separate high school sites; one location could be on Palm Avenue, and an additional location shared with Gavilan College. A 60 acre site for 3,000 students is unmanageable, especially if there is student growth in the future. Suggested that the wording in Policy 232 and 233 in the Plan should be changed from “require” to “encourage” to maintain flexibility.
- Shanna Boigon, representing Santa Clara County Association of Realtors (SCCAOR), indicated that farming and agriculture would not be successful in the Greenbelt. Suggested to find alternative uses for that area, such as large estate homes or equestrian ranches.

6. Adjourn

Co-chair Councilmembers Nancy Pyle and Forrest Williams thanked everyone for coming and complimented the consultants and staff on their hard work.

Co-Chair Councilmember Williams adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:30 p.m.

The next Task Force meeting will take place on February 12, 2007.