

*City of San José*  
***Coyote Valley Specific Plan***

---

**Summary of Task Force Meeting**  
**May 21, 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, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Pat Dando, Russ Danielson, Craige Edgerton, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Dan Hancock, Melissa Hippard, Doreen Morgan, Chris Platten, Ken Saso, Steve Schott, Jr., Steve Speno, and Neil Struthers.

**Task Force Members Absent**

Supervisor Don Gage.

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present**

Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), David Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Michele Difrancia (Caltrain), Mike Griffis (Santa Clara County Roads), Jane Mark (Santa Clara County Parks & Recreation), Sarah Muller (Working Partnerships), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

**City Staff and Other Public Agencies Present**

Lee Wilcox (Council District 10), Ash Kalra (Planning Commission), Rachel Gibson (Office of Supervisor Don Gage), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Stan Ketchum (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Stefanie Hom (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), and Regina Mancera (PBCE).

**Consultants Present**

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Musbach (EPS), Yasmine Farazian (KenKay Associates), Jodi Starbird (David J Powers), and Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers).

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

Nita Barve, Peter Benson, Sherene Bodnar, Pat Cornely, Frank Crane, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Mini Damodaran, Tonya Diamond, Robert Eltgroth, John Fosnaugh, Janet Hebert, Bernardo Hernandez, Virginia Holtz, Jack Kuzia, Michele Korpos, Janis Kelly, Joanne McFarlin, Richard Malupo, Jana Marquardt, Ash Pirayou, Maralee Potter, Peter Rothschild, Jason Reed, Gloria Ritchie, Christina Scell, Esperanza Sanz, Pete Silva, Sharon Simonson, George Thomas Jr., Shelle Thomas, Nicole Tindall, Rudy Tamayo, Al Victors, and Tyler Watts.

### **1. Welcome**

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

Agenda items number four and number five will be switched (changes are reflected in this summary).

#### **2a. Acceptance of April 16, 2007 Task Force Meeting Summary**

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams called for a motion to accept the April 16, 2007 Task Force meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **2b. Acceptance of April 19, 2007 Community Meeting Summary**

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams called for a motion to accept the April 19, 2007 Community Meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- When would the Technical Advisory Committee summary be available? *Susan Walsh, Senior Planner with the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, indicated the summary would be forthcoming, and the TAC comments are included in the Comprehensive Comments in the tonight's packet materials.*

### **3. Overview of the Plan Refinement Process**

Stan Ketchum, Principal Planner with the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, reviewed the meeting agenda and materials. Included in the meeting materials is a compilation of comments on the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) from the

Task Force, Technical Advisory Committee and the Community that staff would be using, along with information from the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), to guide the plan refinement process.

Stan gave an overview of the plan refinement process and what the expected outcomes are. Susan explained why staff is analyzing plan refinements, the plan refinement process, plan refinements and filtering criteria.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- What is the definition of a “refinement”? *Stan indicated the Draft EIR has revealed that some elements in the Plan are not appropriate at their proposed location. The plan refinement process allows staff to make improvements to the plan based on comments and information in the Draft EIR.*

The public provided the following questions and comments:

- Jane Mark, with the County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department, indicated that any plan refinements should be made after the Draft EIR comment period. Then the EIR should be re-circulated. The current process goes against CEQA. *Stan indicated that comments would still be accepted throughout and after the plan refinement process. However, only comments received prior to June 29<sup>th</sup> would be included in the EIR.*

#### **4. Potential Plan Refinements Based on Comments Received (Task Force Discussion)**

Susan presented ideas for four potential refinements based on the list of comprehensive comments received on the Initial Draft of the CVSP included in the meeting materials. Plan refinements have been developed by staff and the consultant team over the last few months. Other comprehensive comments are being evaluated. Questions and comments were provided by the Task Force after each potential refinement was discussed.

1. Provide increased flexibility in residential and workplace land use designations, increase workplace use and integrate throughout Plan
  - Does “increase workplace” mean expand workplace lands, or expand the types of workplace uses? It means increasing workplace land.
  - This issue has been dealt with numerous times. Why are we coming back to it? *Susan indicated staff has received comments on this issue from other agencies and community members.*
  - Should not “pigeonhole” floor area ratios (FARs) on specific parcels. Should just focus on achieving 50,000 jobs in Coyote Valley.
  - FARs should be flexible. The minimum FAR should be .45. There should be greater intensity around the core.
  - Should allow density to increase over time.

- How does transportation fit into flexibility? Flexibility leaves too much open, and would not be able to meet objectives. *Susan indicated that staff and the consultants will continue to look at the issue of FAR flexibility over the next few weeks.*
  - Should analyze if flexibility in the Plan would help accomplish other goals, or if it raises other challenges.
2. Locate second high school site adjacent to Gavilan College Site
- Would there be public transit access to both school locations? *Susan indicated that all of the potential alternative school sites have good access to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).*
  - Want to be careful with mixing high school students with adults.
  - How many acres would each high school be? *Susan indicated the 2,000- student campus in the town center would be 39 acres. The magnet campus adjacent to Gavilan would be 29 acres. There would be a 20 acre residual in the core area.*
  - The net acre loss would be 10 acres. Need to be careful when land is taken out of the Plan.
  - The single high school site is a key component to the Plan. The smaller school would gain a 2<sup>nd</sup> class status. Other cities get by with one high school. Taking away one high school is a mistake. *Stan indicated that Gavilan College and MHUSD have offered to give a presentation about the magnet school shared use concept.*
  - Big advocate of one high school with combined resources. The Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD) needs to consider a more urban approach. Developers are looking at new ideas for density. MUHSD needs to look at how to conserve land.
  - Schools have different funding sources, especially when there is more land.
  - There is a focus on global climate change. We need to change our profile on how we use resources. Need to take a look at how to best implement the future.
  - Need to show how the two separate high schools would work.
  - Could have the first energy efficient high school.
  - Could have individual specialties within the one high school—could be a high school of the future (example: Union City).
  - It is a better use of time to develop something that would fit into the Plan. Creating two smaller high schools does not fit the budget.
  - The MHUSD and Gavilan College should be flexible. Do we have the ability to say “no”? *Stan indicated that the state requirement for a fully accredited junior college is 80 acres.*
  - There would not be 50,000 people in Coyote Valley in one year. Build-out is going to be over 40 – 50 years.
  - A new satellite junior college campus in San Ramon just finished. It has been successful.
  - What is the primary interest in the college? Most of the existing junior colleges are struggling. Would like to see the research to support the need for a new college...
  - Comments on the high schools are frustrating. This is San Jose’s last chance to do it right. It is not sufficient just to say “that is not how we do it”.
  - Should be looking at doing cutting edge ideas.
  - Worthwhile for the City to talk to the State and whoever mandates the State guidelines.
  - Should talk to Peter Mandel with MHUSD to see their thinking.

### 3. Relocate Laguna Seca Ballfields

- Lighted ball fields and fences make it difficult for wildlife to cross.
- The ball fields would be taking up a lot of acreage. Would like to keep land for other uses.
- Are there other ball fields? *Susan indicated there are other ball fields proposed in the Greenbelt, but they are not lit.*
- Do not want to isolate the ball fields.
- The proposed ball fields would be on workplace land. The workplace land would be the economic engine of Coyote Valley.
- The ball fields should be grouped together.
- Would like to see ball fields in San Jose; they can be economically viable.
- What type of fields would they be? *Susan indicated they would be multi-use fields for soccer, baseball, hockey, cricket etc.*
- How many acres would the ball fields be? *Thirty-one acres.*
- It is hard to plan ball fields in middle of workplace-designated land.
- Annexed land in the Greenbelt could be used for ball fields. *Susan indicated the new sports fields would need to be lit and would therefore need to be located in the areas north of Palm Avenue where urban services are planned to be provided.*
- Could have unlit ball fields.
- A lot of lit ball fields are used by adults, and not kids.
- Could locate the ball fields in low-flow areas of Laguna Seca. Should work with the Santa Clara County Water District more on the joint-use idea.
- Should look at the need for ball fields on a regional level.
- Corporations could include ball fields on their sites.
- Should look at doing joint-uses.
- The ball fields should be community-based, not regional.
- Would locating ball fields in Laguna Seca become a legal issue? *Susan indicated that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would own the land in Laguna Seca and they have indicated that the land will need to be maintained as wetland mitigation areas and migratory birds, and should not be planned for urban use.*
- Staff should push back on issues they feel are not compatible with the Plan.
- Other cities are doing joint-uses.
- Should find a creative way to maintain Laguna Seca with the ball fields.
- Does Laguna Seca need all of the land? *Darryl indicated that the Santa Clara Valley Water District intends to use Laguna Seca for wetlands only. There is not a possibility of dual-use.*
- Is Laguna Seca being used for mitigation on other projects? *Yes.*
- Relocating the ball fields would reduce workplace land. The City should work more with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to locate the fields in Laguna Seca. *Susan indicated staff and consultants have identified relocation areas for workplace lands, so the work place acres would not be reduced.*
- Should look at the relocation in an environmental perspective. Laguna Seca would be preserved for wetlands mitigation for both the City and the County.
- Would the ball fields be relocated near the Metcalf Energy Center? *Susan indicated one of the possible locations is south of the support industrial lands that are located south of the Metcalf Energy Center*

- Do not want children to play next to a waste yard and energy plant.
- Would there be any implications in locating the ball fields next to the Metcalf Energy Center? *Susan indicated the alternative ball field site would be not be located that close to MEC, but closer to the new Parkway.*
- If there are going to be two separate high school locations in Coyote Valley, the ball fields could be located on the residual land from the previously planned collegiate high school site.

#### 4. Co-locate Corporation Yard and Solid Waste Transfer Facility

- Why does the City need another waste transfer facility? *Stan indicated the facility would accommodate Coyote Valley.*
- It does not make sense to add another facility. *Susan indicated that the unique design of Coyote Valley, with a lot of mixed-use areas and narrower streets, would not be able to be accommodated by regular waste collection facility.*
- Beginning to feel like the CVSP has lost its way. Has there been outreach to corporate users to see what their needs are? The corporation yard would displace workplace lands.
- Kirby Canyon Landfill is located adjacent to Coyote Valley. Why would there need to be an additional facility? *Susan indicated there is a capacity issue. Waste from Coyote Valley would be going to Newby Island Landfill, not Kirby Canyon Landfill.*
- The Plan would be a grid-plan with few cul-de-sacs.
- The Plan is pushing out workplace for other amenities. Locating a corporation yard and a waste facility does not follow the CVSP vision.
- How much acreage is needed for the corporation yard and waste facility? Need to make sure there is enough acreage available for what the Plan needs. *Susan indicated that the corporation City yard will require 10-acres and the solid waste transfer facility will require 10 acres.*

Susan identified possible sites for relocated workplace and residential uses. Workplace lands could be added at the southerly gateway (on the east and west sides of Monterey Road), and near the new Caltrain station. Residential lands could be added in the Core on the residual high school site, and densities could be increased on areas adjacent to the BRT.

- What does the yellow area on the Plan represent? *Low-density residential.*
- Why should Coyote Valley accommodate additional uses? Staff should be the first resistance to prevent these uses. It is not a good use of Task Force time to discuss these issues. *Stan indicated staff would come back to the Task Force with more ideas for plan refinements.*
- The City pushed hard on Metcalf Energy Center, but is more flexible on other issues.
- Want to keep as much workplace land in Coyote Valley as possible.
- What are the implications on housing? The Plan should drive the economy. Do these changes need to be there? Can they be located anywhere else in city?
- There is heavy-industrial land available along Monterey Highway, near Communications Hill, that would be appropriate for a corporation yard.
- Not everything should be located in Coyote Valley. Want to accommodate corporations for growth.

- Other than providing more flexibility in the Plan, the proposed plan refinements are conducive to the Plan objectives.
- The Plan would be driven by corporate users.
- The City may need to accommodate additional uses to some degree, but it is a give and take.
- Money would be coming out of the land, not the City. That has not been done in other plans in San Jose.
- Requested that all locations would be equally considered. Should be open to accommodate everything. Want to make the best plan that accomplishes all goals.
- Difficult to accommodate every use in Coyote Valley.
- Coyote Valley is going to be a unique and special place. Need to have higher standards to be located there. Need to take a good look at all requests.
- Do not want to be in situation with incompatible land uses that are hard to change.

## **5. Potential Plan Refinements Based on EIR (Task Force Discussion)**

Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner with the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, presented the potential plan refinements based on the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR concludes that there are several significant unavoidable impacts. Potential refinements based on the Draft EIR to mitigate impacts include: further minimize impacts, further maximize onsite mitigation, address the 150' vibration buffer, minimize tree removal, and identify "feasible" wildlife connectivity opportunities.

- Agricultural loss and open space/wildlife impacts were two impacts not covered. *Darryl indicated wildlife is difficult to deal with in terms of plan refinements. For agricultural mitigation, the project does include a 1:1 replacement of agricultural lands. Staff is doing more analysis with Economic Planning Systems (EPS).*
- The City should have a formal agricultural mitigation policy in place.
- Concerned about the loss of open space. Do not want to cover-up the scenery. Should provide amenities for the community.
- Wetland mitigation should not just be a numerical exercise. *Darryl indicated they work with regulatory agencies to make sure they agree with their numbers.*
- Can have quantity and quality. Resource agencies require numbers and quality. Do not give up one for the other.
- The Draft EIR indicates a high percentage of vehicle trips. *Darryl indicated they are still working on traffic impacts. It is a high percentage because the CVSP is a large-scale project.*
- What is the genesis of the 150' railroad vibration buffer? It is not a City policy. *Darryl indicated they did a vibration analysis that concluded there would be significant vibration from the trains.*
- Some areas in north San Jose have a 50' railroad vibration buffer.
- The Plan saves 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the plan area in open space. *Darryl indicated the Plan would not develop on the hillsides.*
- Air quality impacts should be lower with non-vehicular travel. Should look at new ideas to get fewer vehicles. *Darryl indicated it is a challenging issue...*

- If land uses accommodate vehicles, then it generates vehicle usage. *Darryl indicated that there would be 40% internalization of trips. Staff is working to get the percentage higher.*
- Liked the idea of delivering goods to homes.
- Suggested internal trips could be with electric cars and/or golf carts.
- The 88% of trips is a high number. *Darryl indicated the percentage is a little high because of the numeric model they used. It is a numerical exercise.*

The public provided the following questions and comments:

- Tanya Diamond, a student at DeAnza College and San Jose State University, wanted to know when discussions would start on the acquisition of land in along Coyote Creek for the wildlife corridor. *Darryl indicated it would require further environmental review. Staff would work with Santa Clara County parks to put crossing at the best possible locations.*
- Michele Korpos indicated that artificially lit ball fields can impact wildlife movement. Fields should be more centrally located, and then housing can spiral off from the fields.

## **6. Early Cost Implications Based on Potential Plan Refinements (Task Force Discussion)**

Jim Musbach, with Economic Planning Systems (EPS), explained the early cost implications of the plan refinements. The basic economic guiding principles include: development, feasibility, fiscal impacts, and workplace land. Jim indicated the next steps for EPS would be to update the market analysis, define land uses changes due to the plan refinements, and revise the financial and fiscal models.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- What is the lowest residential density that would be allowed in the CVSP? *Jim indicated the lowest density would be 10 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC), single-family detached homes.*
- Suggested to increase densities in low-density areas.
- Need to create livable working spaces in Coyote Valley. Should have dense buildings with open space outside. *Jim indicated there would be a diversity of workspaces in Coyote Valley. Some companies like big floor spaces, and some like dense high-rises.*
- At .45 FAR, the buildings would typically be up to four stories in height.
- Increasing residential density would not add value to the project. Need to be careful in moving things around. *Jim indicated they are not just plugging in numbers, but are looking at what gets built. Can get the same number of units but can end up with significantly less, financially.*
- The Task Force indicated they wanted the design of Coyote Valley to have more height in the center and leveled out towards the hills. The Plan has accomplished that and should stay with that concept.
- Presentation was helpful to remind us of basic guiding economic principles.
- How much more expensive are we making the cost of housing? Do not want to preclude people from coming to Coyote Valley because of the high cost of housing.
- The City is about to start the General Plan update. Should analyze how financially feasible

some of the alternatives would be and how they would contribute to the City. The smaller-scale alternatives may be more appropriate.

- It is the Task Force's responsibility to engage in dialogue with the City Council and the community.
- The City of San Jose indicated they were going to develop Coyote Valley during the 1975 General Plan update. However, while other projects have been passed in the area, property owners that have been annexed into the City for years have not been able to develop their land.
- Coyote Valley is the last chance to plan the last frontier of the City. There is not going to be a lot of other growth elsewhere in the City. It takes pressure off of the other areas in the City to grow. Reducing the number of jobs and housing would be going backwards.
- Any requests to change to the Coyote Valley vision and expected outcomes needs to be taken to the City Council.

Stan concluded that the next steps in the CVSP process are to finalize the plan refinements, respond to Draft EIR comments, develop a phasing, financing and implementation strategy, develop form-based zoning, and continue to do public outreach. Staff plans to bring the CVSP and the EIR to the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption in Fall/Winter 2007.

## **7. Public Comments**

- Jo Crosby, a property owner in the Greenbelt, is unhappy with the CVSP. He does not know what can be done on his land. The City defers his questions to the County, and the County defers his questions to the City. Would like the City to make a decision on the plans for the Greenbelt.
- Consuelo Crosby, a property owner in the Greenbelt, indicated that the CVSP affects the sale of her property. It has been up for sale for a year, but people do not want to invest in it. There is a solar panel fabrication plant and a pre-fabrication structure nearby; the area is becoming an awful mix of uses. The City has no definite answer on plans for the Greenbelt. She would like some response.
- Frank Crane, representing the Mikami Family, had several comments. First, he indicated that a transfer station in Coyote Valley does not fit with the overall goals of the CVSP. Cannot make densities higher and expect the same return. Second, he indicated that the 150' vibration buffer varies by location. Lastly, the EIR should take into account tree longevity.

## **8. Adjourn**

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

Co-Chair Councilmember Williams adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:45 p.m.

The next Task Force meeting will take place on June 18, 2007, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m...

Y:\CVSP Mtgs\_TASKFORCE\Meeting Summary\TF\_56\_06.18.07\Task Force\_Meeting#56\_05 21 07\_Task Force Meeting.doc