

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Task Force Meeting March 14, 2005 151 West Mission Street, Room 202 A and B

Task Force Members Present:

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams, Supervisor Don Gage, Chuck Butters, Eric Carruthers, Russ Danielson, Craig Edgerton, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Chris Platten, Ken Saso, Steve Speno and Neil Struthers.

Task Force Members Absent:

Co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales, Helen Chapman, Jim Cunneen, Gladwyn D'Souza, Steve Schott Jr., Phaedra-Ellis Lamkins and Terry Watt.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:

Tedd Faraone (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning), Bobbie Fischler (League of Women Voters), Virginia Holtz (FROG), Trixie Johnson (FROG), Jane Mark (County Parks), Elizabeth Petrinovich (Office of Senator Abel Maldonado), Pat Sausedo (NAIOP), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Tim Steele (Sobrato), Rebecca Tolentino (City of Morgan Hill), Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group) and Sarah Muller (Working Partnerships).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:

Jennifer Malutta (Mayor's Office), Keith Stamps (Council District 2), Emily Moody (Council District 2), Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), Rachael Gibson (Don Gage's Office), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Joseph Horwedel (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Gerry De Guzman (Public Works), Rebecca Flores (Housing) and Paul Prange (ESD).

Consultants Present:

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers & Associates) and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

Community Members Present:

Jerry Amaro, Andrea Ballestera, Richard Barbari, Rosalie Cacitti, Dawn Cameron, Frank Crane, June Crane, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Fred Chirico, David Cross, Gail DeSmet, Richard DeSmet, Jack Faraone, Eric Flippo, Melanie Frost, Andrew Fuller, Len Grilli, Guercio Garcia, Paul Hebert, Liz Hirata, Lisa Jafferries, Jack Kuzia, Pat Kuzia, Jim Lightbody, Rick Linquist, Randy Linquist, Jeremy Madsen, Chris Marchese, Dennis Martin, Tim Muller, Norm Matteoni, Ashley Neufeld, Ed Osborne, Kristen Powell, Greg Poncetta, Ron Pusatera, Ken Pusatera, Ray Russo, Frans Rossen, Chris Riley, Annie Saso, Pete Silva, Nathan Wasserman, Don Weden, Kim Weden and Michael Wood.

1. Welcome:

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

Supervisor Don Gage reported meeting with Councilmember Williams and he met with several Greenbelt property owners on March 2, 2005. They discussed several Greenbelt issues and outlined others that need to be addressed further. They will bring their ideas to the Task Force for consideration.

2. Acceptance of February 7, 2005 Task Force Meeting Summary:

Councilmember Williams called for a motion to accept the meeting summary for the February 7, 2005 Task Force meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Review of Work Program:

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, reviewed the CVSP work program through March 2006. Upcoming Task Force meetings would review and discuss CVSP goals and policies, the financing strategy, fiscal impact study, design guidelines and zoning code documents. Meetings would also be held to discuss the EIR scoping and process. The City would continue to hold community meetings to update Coyote Valley

property owners and other stakeholders on the CVSP process. The CVSP staff will present the third CVSP progress report to the City Council on Tuesday, April 5, 2005.

4. Results of Early Consultation Meetings on the CVSP EIR:

Joseph Horwedel, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, reviewed the major comments received at the early EIR consultation meetings in March 2005 and discussed the next steps in the environmental review process. Comments made involved project alternatives, biology, hydrology, water quality, traffic, urban services and the Greenbelt. Joe indicated that the EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) would be released in April 2005, and the draft EIR (DEIR) will be circulated in September 2005. Planning Commission certification of the final EIR is anticipated in February 2006, and the City Council public hearing on the CVSP in March 2006.

Co-chair Williams asked for questions and comments from the Task Force and the following were provided:

- Would like more time to review Task Force meeting materials.
- Will the County review the NOP? *Joe answered in the affirmative.*
- Would the EIR begin from the ground up? *Joe explained that most of the information would be obtained from previous baseline environmental studies, but that a lot of information still needs to be collected.*
- Would the EIR capture the two-year CVSP process up to this point? *Joe responded in the affirmative.*
- Recommend that all of the work done thus far in the CVSP process should be encapsulated in the EIR.
- How long is the DEIR review period? *Joe stated it is a 30-day review period.*
- Will a separate EIR be prepared for transportation projects? *Joe explained that most of the CVSP EIR would be done at a programmatic level for future transportation facilities, with some aspects being analyzed at a project level. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the EIR study the reasonably foreseeable impacts.*
- Would the EIR study impacts on south Santa Clara and San Benito Counties? *Joe explained that the EIR would study the traffic impact in the area as well as the traffic impacts to some of the surrounding areas in the region. The Coyote Valley Research Park (CVRP) EIR studied traffic impacts down to Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties.*
- Was the South Almaden traffic impact study for Almaden Athletic Association (AYA) done at a programmatic or project level? *Joe said that it was done at the project level. He indicated that the EIR provides enough information for decision-making*
- Would the EIR address the environmental impacts on public and institutional services? *Joe indicated that the EIR would address the environmental impacts on public and institutional services from a programmatic level.*

- Would the EIR address the environmental impact on medical services? *Joe explained that the EIR would study that impact at a program level*
- Would the EIR discuss mitigation? *Joe explained that the EIR would discuss mitigation for each impact identified.*
- Will agricultural mitigation be addressed in the EIR? *Joe indicated that the city does not have an agricultural mitigation standard. CEQA requires that mitigation be economically feasible.*
- Would air quality mitigation be addressed in the EIR? He answered in the affirmative.
- Would solar energy be a mitigation alternative? *He explained that mitigation alternatives such as solar energy might be analyzed in the EIR. The EIR would address potential mitigation and their respective benefits and feasibility.*
- The EIR should acknowledge the planned developments that are already approved. Some parcels in the Coyote Valley have been annexed to the City for years. The 50,000 job requirement is a part of the General Plan. Planned development permits have been issued for 20,000 jobs. *Joe explained that these issues would be discussed in the land use history section of the EIR.*
- If any changes were made to the CVSP, would the EIR need to be re-done? *He indicated that it would depend on how significant the change to the plan was.*
- It is important for the EIR to be broad and allow flexibility.
- Indication that no one is bringing their money to the table to support the CVSP, and that people are only indicating what they would like to have.
- How detailed are the project alternatives descriptions? *Joe explained that the project alternatives must provide a meaningful description for readers to understand what the project alternative would look like. Project alternatives must lessen the environmental impact.*
- Indication that east side Monterey Highway should be developed early since it has been annexed to the city since 1958 and has been designated as an Urban Reserve since 1984.
- Indication that the Greenbelt Alliance's *Getting it Right* is insensitive to east side Monterey Highway's land history.
- Concern that analyzing the Greenbelt Alliance's *Getting it Right* components separately would be inappropriate because they are mutually reinforcing.
- What is the connection between the EIR and HCP? *Joe explained that the two documents are intertwined, yet separate. The goal is not to do things with the CVSP that makes the HCP infeasible. The City, County, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) are working together. The goal is to have the CVSP be consistent with the HCP. Joe indicated that the HCP would be completed in a few years.*

Co-chair Williams asked for comments from the public and the following were provided:

- Virginia Holtz, with the Friends of the Coyote Valley Greenbelt (FROG), recommended that the EIR address: (1) the potential environmental impacts of and mitigation for development, (2) the relationship of the cross-valley aqueduct and PG&E transmission lines to Coyote Valley, (3) ways to minimize and mitigate traffic impacts, (4) the impacts and mitigation of the interface between the urban area and the Greenbelt, and (5) the loss

of agricultural lands and provide a fund for agricultural mitigation in the Greenbelt. The EIR should not include any project alternatives for the Greenbelt that allow further land development inconsistent with current County and City policy.

- Brian Schmidt, with the Committee for Green Foothills, referred a joint letter from three environmental agencies to the Task Force. He suggested locating the 50,000 jobs and 25,000 residential units in downtown where BART is planning to extend its services. He also recommended measuring significant impacts based on existing conditions rather than after the CVRP development.
- Jeremy Madsen, with the Greenbelt Alliance, thanked the Task Force and staff for considering the Greenbelt Alliance's *Getting It Right* as a project alternative. He referred to their letter to the Task Force. He indicated that the CVSP would not create a transit-oriented, pedestrian-friendly, bicycle-friendly community. Jeremy suggested using components of *Getting It Right* (e.g. the grid-based street system, floodplain versus the lake and more regionally integrated transit) as a framework for the CVSP.
- Consuelo Crosby, a South Coyote Valley property owner, indicated that most of the property owners who attended the early EIR consultation community meetings were Greenbelt property owners. She indicated that tonight's meeting did not address the Greenbelt. Consuelo said that she felt ignored and frustrated as a Greenbelt property owner. She would like the Task Force to review the comments made by Greenbelt property owners at the early EIR consultation meeting. She feels that their comments are being ignored.
- Frank Crane, representing the Mikami family, suggested that the east side of Monterey Highway should be included in the first phase of development. He indicated that excluding the east side of Monterey Highway from the CVSP would make the plan infeasible. Frank was also concerned about the amount of land needed for the Coyote Creek Parkway. He recommended decreasing the impact on existing properties in order to create a cohesive heritage.

5. Public Comments:

Co-chair Williams asked for comments from the public and the following were provided:

- Melanie Frost, an east side Monterey Highway property owner, explained that her family has farming roots and have lived in the Coyote Valley for seven generations. She indicated that the proposed parkway would go through her property and that a proposed access road would go through her other property. Melanie recommended relocating the parkway south of her property or moving it over to the Metcalf Road overpass to decrease the impact on existing properties.
- Jo Crosby, a South Coyote Valley property owner, indicated that the plan for the Greenbelt is ludicrous and that agriculture is not viable. He thanked Don Gage for listening to the Greenbelt property owners. The Greenbelt property owners should be acknowledged as much as the environmental species.

- Richard DeSmet, with the Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning, questioned the purpose and location of the greenline, and asked whether it could be moved. He indicated that the lack of economic incentives has led to blighted areas in the Greenbelt. Richard said that if they are going to be relegated to farming then it should be noted on the deeds of all property owners in the Greenbelt. He indicated that farming and urban development does not mix well. He recommended that the EIR analyze the City Council's 16 Vision and Expected Outcomes to see if they make sense.

6. Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:05 p.m. The next Task Force meeting will take place on April 11, 2005.