

*City of San Jose*

## ***Coyote Valley Specific Plan***

---

### **Summary of Community Meeting May 26, 2005 Coyote Creek Golf Club**

#### **Community Members Present:**

Larry Ames, Robert Anorels, Rob Barthelman, Pete Benson, Peter Bolhshel, Stefanie Brand, Darlene Campbell, Vince Cantore, Wai Fong Chan, Marvin Christy, Parg Cisenski, J. Clay, Frank Crane, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, David Cross, Jona Denz-Hamilton Richard DeSmet, Tim Demetu, Luis F., Robert Freiri, Dr. Bud Figueroa, Dennis Figueroa, Robert Gafalt, Art Gonzales, Evelyn Guess, Mike Hamilton, Janet Herbert, Paul Herbert, Dan Higgins, Xay Hoang, Jerry Hoefling, Bob Howard, Shari Kaplan, Jack Kuzia, Joe Kwong, Lee Lester, Bun Leung, Ted Leung, Vic LoBue, Peter Mandel, Chris Marchese, Harry Mikami, Hiroko Mikami, Siu Lan Mok, Joe Mueller, Yamashia Naoko, Emile Nijmeh, Dick Norman, Dan Perusina, Arlene Perusina, Garrett Rajkovich, Moses Ramirez, Paul Ruscitco, Jenny Sakaue, Robert Sakaue, Robert Snively, Sumiko Sorakubo, Charles Spencer, Linda Spencer, Kathy Sullivan, Kenny Tam, Rocky Tam, Wayland Tam, Lowell Tan, George Thomas Jr., Shellé Thomas, Gerald Upshaw, Al Victors, Eric von Forstmeyer, Herman Wadler, Albert Yamauchi, Ji-Hai Yang and Guop Yuan.

#### **Task Force Members Present:**

Ken Saso.

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

Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), David Bischoff (Consultant to the City of Morgan Hill), Shanna Boigon (Association of Realtors), Tracey Chew (Bay Area Housing Group), Tedd Faraone (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning), Melissa Hippard (Sierra Club), Jane Mark (County Parks), Tim Steele (Sobrato Development Corporation) and Bonnie Tognazzini (Morgan Hill Unified School District).

#### **City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:**

Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir

(PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Rebecca Flores (Housing), Bill Miller (SJPD) and Dave Mitchell (PRNS).

## **Consultants:**

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jack Hsu (Dahlin Group), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Jim Musbach (EPS), Darin Smith (EPS), Jim Thompson (HMH Engineers), Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers & Associates) and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting convened at 6:00 p.m. with Eileen Goodwin, with Apex Strategies, welcoming everyone to the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) community meeting. A show of hands indicated that about 20 of the attendees were newcomers, and about 50 people attended the Environmental Impact Review (EIR) community meeting in March 2005. A show of hands also indicated that about 50 heard about meeting via postcard, 30 via e-mail, 1 by word of mouth and 1 through the CVSP website. Approximately 70 of the attendees were Coyote Valley property owners.

## **2. Agenda and Process Overview**

Eileen reviewed the agenda and indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Land Use Plan Concept (Plan Concept) refinements, which have been underway since the last community meeting. Nine tables will be set-up to facilitate the discussion of the Plan Concept. The goal is for community members to learn more about the history of the CVSP and the refinements to the Plan Concept, beginning with four of CVSP's planning areas – Bailey Avenue/Monterey Road area, the Lake/Core area, Santa Teresa Boulevard between the Lake and the southerly Parkway system, and Palm Canyon at the south west quadrant between the southerly Parkway system and Santa Teresa Boulevard. The other CVSP planning areas would be reviewed at future community workshops.

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, provided an overview of the CVSP. The City Council initiated the CVSP in August 2002. Since then, the CVSP team has done technical analysis of Coyote Valley's existing conditions and developed and refined infrastructure, land use and design concepts. Staff has done extensive outreach through meetings with the City Council, Task Force, Technical Advisory Committee, community, property owners, stakeholders, sub-committees, focus groups, etc. The CVSP will go to Council consideration in Spring 2006. Laurel also reviewed drawings of the environmental footprint, modified public realm, illustrative land uses and an aerial rendition of the CVSP area.

### **3. Refinements to the Land Use Plan Concept**

Doug Dahlin, with Dahlin Group, presented an update to the Plan Concept. The alignment of the fixed transit guideway has been improved to increase accessibility to work nodes along Monterey Highway. The new alignment also goes down the middle of Santa Teresa Boulevard southward before diverging in a southwesterly direction to the core of the Palm Canyon planning area. The new transit alignment will intensify the workplace and mixed-use areas located along Santa Teresa Boulevard. Road connections include the Parkway throughout the community and the traditional grid system within each neighborhood. Numerous over-/under-crossings allow the Parkway and Monterey Highway to remain permeable. The grid system will be of low-volume capacity and consist of small blocks to encourage walkability. The grid system is also designed to focus land uses on amenities such as transit, parks and the lake. Additionally, neighborhoods will also be connected by a comprehensive system of transit and pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails.

The Plan includes sites for seven elementary schools and two middle schools. The current Plan includes a 40-acre site for one high school. However, there is a new alternative, innovative high school concept that features two collegiate-like high schools sharing facilities on a single 60-acre campus.

Doug indicated that tonight's community meeting would allow attendees to look at the Bailey Avenue/Monterey Road, the Lake, Santa Teresa Boulevard and Palm Canyon planning areas (Areas B, A, I and K, respectively) at 500 scale. Eileen encouraged the attendees to write down any input, questions and comments.

#### Breakout Workstations:

Nine workstations were set up to gather input from community members. One table, the history table, would provide background information for newcomers and others who have not followed the CVSP with regularity. The remaining eight tables were organized in four pairs, each devoted to one planning area. Participants would rotate through all four planning areas, spending 15-20 minutes at each.

Community members provided the following questions and comments:

- a. History
  - Who initiated the CVSP? Who oversees the CVSP? *City Council initiated the CVSP in August 2002 and the Task Force oversees its progress.*
  
- b. Planning Area B – Bailey Avenue
  - Lack of pedestrian access across the railroad tracks and Monterey Road. *Jim Thompson indicated that there would be six pedestrian crossings across Monterey Highway and the railroad tracks. These crossings will have connections to trails, planned grade separations and transit.*

- Suggested having internal shuttles connecting the east and west sides of Monterey Road in the Bailey Avenue area.
  - Need to provide adequate access to commercial areas.
  - Will the Bailey Over-the-Hill connection allow the development of the Almaden Valley Urban Reserve or will this be a permanent block? *Neither. Jim Thompson indicated that improvements to Bailey Avenue Over-the Hill and McKean Road would be required to mitigate impacts of the CVSP. Those improvements will not facilitate development of the Almaden Valley Urban Reserve area.*
  - There is a poor connection northeast of Bailey Avenue and Monterey Highway.
  - The plan provides awkward access to the community through Bailey Avenue.
  - Workplace access from Highway 101 into this area is poor and circuitous. *Jim Thompson indicated that they are working on refinements to the circulation system that will improve access to these areas and the connectivity between East side and West side Monterey Highway.*
  - Workplaces should be more accessible to residents outside of Coyote Valley.
  - Need trail access from workplaces to the Coyote Creek Parkway trail.
  - Walking distances are too far from transit.
  - Need to incorporate more residential units.
  - Need more landscaping.
- c. Planning Area A – The Lake and Core Area
- Concerned that people will need to drive through the Core before getting to IBM.
  - Lack of pedestrian access from transit to commercial areas.
  - Creating a ghetto with high density.
  - Need requirements to ensure building height and density.
  - Need view sheds at intersections.
  - Make sure we maintain view of the lake.
  - Need local shops within easy walking distance from residential areas. Would like a walkable community like Willow Glen.
  - How will the lake and canal have water supply year-round?
  - Where will the water go when we have heavy rain?
  - How will flood control work in a 100-year floodplain?
  - How will FEMA insurance work?
  - Need drop-off and pick-up system for high school parents to prevent back-ups.
  - Will there be an administrative town center (i.e. planning, council representative, urban services, fire and police, hospital, etc.)?
  - Where is the parking for mixed-use areas?
  - Transit by the lake should be pedestrian only with minimal vehicular use. This will improve transit speed and be more aesthetically pleasing.
  - Recommended having a hotel around the lake instead of a hospital. Indication that a hospital is not needed since hospitals in the area have been closed.
  - Suggested having places of worship around the lake. Places of worship are typically located in the center of a city. Should also have places of worship throughout the neighborhoods.
  - Why not open the hillock area up to the public so that there can be recreational hiking?

- Is the lake still going to have a sheer drop/free board?
- If the lake is for flood control, it should be deeper.
- What will the banks of the lake look like?
- How deep is the canal?
- Design the International Park so that it can accommodate outdoor concerts or some sort of entertainment focal point for the community.
- Are you planning to create an area similar to New York City's Central Park?

d. Planning Area I – Santa Teresa Boulevard

- Why is Area I shaped the way it is?
- Roundabouts are typically extremely slow.
- How practical are roundabouts? Indication that they work in England, but not in Washington D.C.
- Recommended against having the fixed guideway at grade-level.
- What will the speed limit be on the parkway?
- Recommended planting shrubs in raised beds in the medians between the sidewalk and transit to minimize pedestrian disturbance to landscaping.
- What will the character of Santa Teresa Boulevard be
- (e.g. how many lanes, intersections, etc.)?
- Why is single-use retail designed with surface parking instead of structure parking?

e. Planning Area K – Palm Canyon

- Will there be parks and open space in the medium-high density (12-25 dwelling units/acre) residential areas?
- What type of edge treatment will there be along Fisher Creek and developed areas?
- Likes the bicycle trail along Fisher Creek.
- Too many homes are close to the flood zones.
- Will affordable housing be segregated, or integrated into the project?
- Provide litter bins along trails/
- Why provide playfields north of Palm Avenue when there would be a large play area south of Palm Avenue?
- People that have migrated out of San Jose and Santa Clara County because of high housing prices may move into Coyote Valley because it is closer to where they work.
- Will there be room on the roads for big service trucks?
- What is the capacity of the water supply and sewer system planned for Coyote Valley?
- Provide restrooms within the proposed Greenbelt ball fields, even if on septic tanks.
- The fixed transit guideway should connect daily to the Greenbelt ball fields, thereby diminishing the reliance on automobiles.
- How much parking is being proposed for the ball fields south of Palm Avenue?

Community members also provided questions and comments that were not specific to any of the planning areas, but had general applicability to the CVSP. These questions and comments

included:

### General

- The CVSP is a big boost for South County. This community will improve the City's image and make it a better place.
- Will there be buffer areas between all edges of sports fields and residential neighborhoods?
- The canal should be big enough to canoe.
- What will happen to the students attending Encinal Elementary School, which is a charter school?
- Will there be sound walls along the train tracks and at the Caltrain station?
- Where would be the best place to invest?
- Need to respect and enhance the riparian corridor and discourage the use of invasive or exotic plants. *Jim Thompson reassured that respecting and enhancing the riparian corridor is one of the CVSP's objectives.*
- Suggested having a trail on the west side of Coyote Creek for employees. *Jim Thompson said that the City is working with the County Parks and the Santa Clara Valley Water District to plan for a trail on the west side of Coyote Creek. The trail will extend from the North end to the South end of the project area.*
- Why don't the new blocks conform to existing parcel shapes? *The new blocks are designed smaller to encourage walkability.*
- Recommended against shading of creek habitat. *Jim Thompson indicated that biologists and regulators would provide specific guidelines for this area. The City is also aware of the FACHE Agreement, which contains related criteria as well.*
- Where will commuters into Coyote Valley come from? Portola Valley?
- What type of connection will there be between Fisher Creek, Monterey Highway and Coyote Creek?

### Residential

- Who is going to be living in Coyote Valley?
- Who will live in the high-density residential units?
- Will affordable housing be high-density residential units?
- Would like to see ¼ to 1-acre lots.
- Need to take into consideration multiple families living in one residential unit which will result in impacts on schools, traffic, etc.

### Circulation System

- The City is ignoring the obvious connection to VTA's light rail system; this should be a major component to the CVSP. Need to include the light rail service for speedy access. *Jim Thompson explained that studies show that there would not be enough ridership to extend the light rail system 6.5 miles into Coyote Valley. However, there will be a rail connection between the nearest light rail stop and the Caltrain station. The Plan's transit system will have the capability to be converted to light rail in the future.*
- Suggested having an underground light rail system.

- Will transit stations be covered from sun and rain?
- Who pays for the rubber-tired transit?
- More residential units mean more cars.
- Will the transit system have the adequate capacity to get high school students to and from school within 15 minutes?
- Different types of places of worship generate different traffic problems. (i.e. churches have peak traffic periods, whereas mosques and temples do not.)
- How will commuters get to work? Will there be traffic analysis?
- Need equestrian trails, particularly along Fisher Creek.

#### South Coyote Greenbelt

- How will Greenbelt residents be affected?
- Will there be parking for the sport fields? Will it be located on-site or on neighborhood streets?
- How will urban services be handled for the sports field?
- Transit should go to the sports field.
- Concerned about lit sports fields in the Greenbelt.
- Recommended having a transit system through the Greenbelt since it is intended to be a destination for visitors.
- Where will people park if they are visiting the Greenbelt?
- Recommended having pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails in the Greenbelt.

#### EIR

- What is the time schedule for the EIR field studies for private property owners? *Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner with the PBCE Department, stated that field studies on properties for which the City received access permission will begin sometime in June, and will take place over the next few months. Staff will be coordinating with various studies to minimize the duration of any potential disruption to property owners or their tenants.*
- The Valley Transportation (VTA) Plan 2030 does not seem to offer any help to Almaden Expressway, south of Coleman Road. Camden Avenue currently has level of service (LOS) "F." Will the EIR offer any hope for improvement? *Darryl explained that the EIR is an information document for the CVSP. The EIR will analyze the transportation impacts from the proposed project, identify potentially significant impacts, and identify mitigation measures to reduce the significant project impacts to a less than significant level. The CVSP will not, and is not legally required, to fix preexisting transportation problems or impacts from other projects.*

## **4. Phasing Consideration**

Eileen had a question and answer session with Jim Musbach of Economic and Planning Systems. Jim Musbach answered the following frequently asked questions:

- How will infrastructure improvements be financed? *There are multiple sources of funding, including development fees. Most of the financed value will be created by the Plan's land uses. Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) require voter approval. Phasing will depend on "financing of the willing."*
- What is the time frame for development? *Some development can begin now due to existing entitlements. CVSP development may begin as early as 2007. The time frame for build-out is approximately 25 years.*
- Explain "phasing of the willing." *The term "financing of the willing" is preferred to "phasing of the willing." Financing of the willing allows property owners to proceed with phasing once they are ready to finance.*
- How will costs be allocated? *All property owners are required to dedicate approximately 30 percent of their land for the public realm. Contributions vary depending on an individual property's land use. For instance, properties with residential land uses may pay for parks, whereas high-density land uses may pay for roads. Property owners who dedicate more than their fair share of land will be compensated via in-lieu fees by those who did not dedicate their fair share.*
- How do costs vary between workplace and retail land uses? *Costs depend on the demand for the facility. For example, workplace uses pay a higher allocation for public right-of-way, whereas residential uses would pay for parks.*
- How will the Greenbelt be financed? *Permanent Greenbelt conservation is necessary. The team is still determining how the Greenbelt will be financed and is considering various financing strategies. Development fees can be used to purchase conservation easements from willing sellers. An entity may be established to maintain the easements and maximize its value. Another alternative is that property owners can continue to own the land, but will sell their development rights to an open space entity in perpetuity. Property owners may still use their property for agricultural uses, and other uses allowed under the County General Plan.*

Community members provided the following questions and comments:

- When will North and Mid-Coyote Valley be annexed into the City? How will this impact taxes on current property owners? *North and Mid Coyote Valley would be annexed into the City after the Council adopts the Plan. Property owners are still subject to Proposition 13, and tax levies are subject to voter approval. If a property were sold, it would be reappraised at market value.*
- Concerned about Mayor Ron Gonzales and Councilmember Forest Williams changing the triggers from requiring 5,000 jobs before residential development can begin to a concurrent 2:1 jobs-to-housing development. *The proposed trigger may be more stringent than the current trigger due to the 2:1 jobs-to-housing concurrency requirement. The Plan would still need to meet policy objectives, have sufficient funding and be phased logically. There will be further discussion the Mayor's and Councilmember's proposed triggers at the June 20<sup>th</sup> Task Force. Additional information will also be available on the CVSP website.*
- Concerned that Coyote Valley will be in the flight line of the expanded Mineta San Jose International Airport. *The EIR will address this issue.*
- Will the EIR study the Plan's traffic impact on Bailey Over-the-Hill, McKean Road and Almaden Expressway? *Laurel responded in the affirmative.*

- Will the CVSP address crime such as violence and theft? *There will be a plan for public services and public safety. Staff has been meeting with other City departments regarding these issues.*
- The memorandum by Mayor Gonzales and Councilmember Williams proposes that properties will be assessed per acre irrespective of density. Is this consistent with the assessment outlined this evening? *This issue is still on the table for discussion. This proposal is to encourage higher density, not penalize it.*
- What is the rationale for the lake? *The lake serves flood control and water retention purposes. The water table is high in Coyote Valley and the lake is located in a low point in the area. Additional technical information regarding the lake is available on the CVSP website.*
- What if the “financing of the willing” wants to build in the wrong place? (i.e., people want to build an apartment in the middle of the lake.) *The land use plan will guide type and location.*
- Will the Plan provide “spaces for jobs” or actual “jobs”? *The CVSP will designate specific areas for workplace use and developers will apply for permits to develop projects, which will in turn create jobs. However, jobs are not speculative and will be tenant- and market-driven. Large employers will be attracted to Coyote Valley because they want large campuses and high-profile facilities.*
- A retired real estate broker stated that the CVSP is an excellent plan. He indicated that he knows of many builders and developers that would be interested in purchasing property in Coyote Valley.
- Will there be tax incentives to encourage agricultural uses in the Greenbelt? *The Williamson Act program allows lower taxes in exchange for continued agricultural uses and open space conservation. An open space entity can also have the ability to subsidize and collect funds and resources from those who support open space.*
- How will the Plan impact sale of property? *Each property would have an underlying zoning indicating proposed land uses. The Plan is an advantage because it allows for higher density development and will create higher value.*
- The Greenbelt has not been mentioned at tonight’s community meeting. When will a Greenbelt strategy be developed? *Laurel indicated that the Greenbelt strategy is on the same schedule as the rest of the CVSP.*
- Who is paying for off-site improvements for the sewer that goes to Alviso? *All off-site costs are included in the infrastructure costs. Infrastructure is typically sized to accommodate other parts of the city. Other areas of the City will help to finance the sewer.*
- The Plan proposes a minimum of 50,000 driving industry jobs. Service jobs should be included since they also impact the economy. *Retail and government jobs are excluded from the 50,000 jobs. Mixed-use areas will include driving industry jobs such as real estate brokers, attorneys, etc.*
- The water table by Santa Teresa Boulevard and Bailey Avenue is about 3-4 feet. This is a natural place for a lake. *Jim Thompson agreed.*

## **5. Next Steps/Adjourn**

Laurel thanked the attendees for their comments and participation in the community meeting. The CVSP Plan Concept is still under refinement, and comments from tonight’s meeting will be

forwarded to the Task Force. The next Task Force meeting has been changed from June 13, 2005 to June 20, 2005. The meeting will be held in the City's Health Building from 5:30 - 8:00 p.m. to discuss the remaining points in the Co-chairs' memorandum. Public comments are limited to two minutes at Task Force meetings. However, staff also welcomes written comments via e-mail or letters. The next community workshop will be in Summer 2005.

Laurel reminded property owners that the City sent an EIR letter requesting access to properties for environmental analysis. While property owners have the option to allow property access, if property owners deny access, they will need to have environmental review done for their property at their own expense before any development takes place.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:05 p.m.