

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Task Force Meeting #8

151 West Mission Street, Room 202 a and b

Summary of the Meeting of
November 10, 2003

Task Force Members Present:

Mayor Ron Gonzales (co-chair), Councilmember Forrest Williams (co-chair), Christopher Platten, Chuck Butters, Doreen Morgan, Eric Carruthers, Gladwyn D'Souza, Helen Chapman, Jim Cunneen, Ken Saso, Pat Dando (Vice Mayor), Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Russ Danielson, Steve Schott Jr., and Terry Watt.

Task Force Members Absent:

Supervisor Don Gage, Craige Edgerton, Dan Hancock, Neil Struthers, and Steve Speno

Community Members Present:

Tim Muller, Steven Kinsella, Roger Costa, Tim Steele, Wayne O'connell, Chris Metzger, Shannon Werner, Erik Schoennauer, Walter Rask, Kerry Williams, Jack Kuzia, Dennis Martin, Lynn Parlon, Matt Freeman, and Joe Burch, Shannon Werner, and Chris Metzger.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:

Pat Sausedo, Bobbie Fishler, Michael Bomberger, Ann Draper, Mike Griffis, Bill Smith, and Jessica Fitchen.

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:

Councilmember Linda LeZotte, Jennifer Malutta (Mayor's Office), Emily Moody (District 2), Keith Stamps (District 2), Denelle Fedor (District 10), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE),

Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jenny Nusbaum (PBCE), Bill Smith (SCVWD), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Mike Griffis, (Santa Clara County Roads and Airports).

Consultants:

Jodi Starbird (David J Powers & Associates), Tom Armstrong (HMH), Jim Thompson (HMH), Christy Chung (Schaaf and Wheeler), Chuck Anderson (Schaaf and Wheeler), Gary Black (Hexagon), and Tom Fraser (Wetlands Research Associates).

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at 5:40 p.m. Co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales opened the meeting by welcoming everyone in attendance to the eighth meeting of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force. Members of the Task Force then introduced themselves.

2. Acceptance of October 6, 2003 Meeting Summary

Co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales called for a motion to accept the meeting summary for October 6, 2003. A motion was made to accept the summary, and passed unanimously.

3. Debrief from First Set of Community Meetings

Sal Yakubu, a Principal Planner in the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, indicated that the first community meeting was held on October 28, 2003, was attended by more than 50 people including seven Task Force members (Mayor Ron Gonzales, Councilmember Forrest Williams, Supervisor Don Gage, Craig Edgerton, Eric Carruthers, Ken Saso, and Russ Danielson). The second community meeting, held on November 8, 2003, was attended by more than 65 people including six Task Force members (Councilmember Forrest Williams, Helen Chapman, Craig Edgerton, Doreen Morgan, Eric Carruthers, and Ken Saso).

Members of the community in attendance included residents, property owners, health practitioners, members of the faith community, environmental groups, representatives from the Morgan Hill Unified School District, Calpine Corporation and various unions, and a member of the City of Morgan Hill Planning Commission.

Sal summarized the issues that were discussed at these meetings. They included the following comments, recommendations, questions, and concerns:

- a) The timeframe for annexation (especially of the lands in the Greenbelt).

- b) Water supply, high water table, and the status of the area as a water recharge zone.
- c) Future transportation impacts and a recommendation to look at rapid bus transit rather than light rail due to difficult economic times confronting the VTA.
- d) Support for transit-oriented development.
- e) Protection of the existing country atmosphere.
- f) Inappropriateness of intense urban development.
- g) Lack of clarity for the rationale for the location of the Greenbelt and concern for the protection of the Greenbelt.
- h) Potential impacts on existing residents and their overall quality of life.
- i) Potential changes in the tax base of existing property owners due to urbanization.
- j) Advocacy that new development should pay its way and not diminish the existing levels of services.
- k) Protection against expansion of Calpine and heavy industrial development.
- l) The need for new development to pay for schools.
- m) The need for new elementary, middle and high schools for a future population of more than 75,000.
- n) Protection of small property owners from big time developers.
- o) Provision of affordable housing (especially for low and very low income residents, not just moderate income).
- p) Provision of adequate community services, and an adequate road network to handle traffic.
- q) Provision of adequate health care facilities to support the projected population.
- r) The need to develop a viable plan for the Greenbelt
- s) To hold future meetings in different locations and have more advanced notice for meetings.

- t) Desist from the traditional industrial development pattern (with the sea of parking) but to plan for innovative approaches that respond to the changing needs of industry.
- u) Urban development will degrade the existing levels of services below the 1993 level stipulated in the San Jose 2020 General Plan.
- v) Conduct an analysis of appropriate types of jobs for the Coyote Valley.
- w) The development of North and Mid Coyote Valley should be planned together.

Sal indicated that the notes from the community meetings would be summarized and given to the Task Force. Co-chair Forrest Williams indicated that the input from the community meetings would be carefully considered in the development of the Specific Plan. Eric Carruthers complimented Planning staff on the great job that they did at the community meetings and Russ Danielson thanked Laurel Prevetti and Jessica Fitchen, from the Greenbelt Alliance, for their good presentation to the Morgan Hill Unified School District recently.

4. Land Use Policies: San Jose 2020 General Plan, North Coyote Valley Master Development Plan, Greenbelt Planning Principles

Sal explained that the Task Force had discussed existing land use in September and presented additional information in the form of excerpts from the San Jose 2020 General Plan regarding the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve (in the green handout). He stated that there are two urban reserves in the City, one in South Almaden Valley and the other in Coyote Valley. The Coyote Valley Urban Reserve includes the valley floor area on both sides of Monterey Highway west of Coyote Creek, from just north of Laguna Avenue to Palm Avenue in the south. The General Plan includes the following vision statements for the development of the Coyote Urban Reserve:

- a) Coyote Valley is relatively isolated from the rest of San Jose and therefore, future development for this area should be in the form of an independent community, with jobs, housing, commercial uses, schools, parks and other residential service facilities, infrastructure and public transit. In effect a new town is called for.
- b) It should be a self-sufficient, very urban area with pedestrian-oriented mixed uses including a minimum of 25,000 residential units.
- c) The North and the Mid Coyote areas should be planned together with the North Coyote Campus Industrial area as the key job center, and the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve (or the Mid-Coyote Valley) as the primary new residential area.
- d) There should be permanent protection for the Coyote Greenbelt area.

- e) A thorough planning process is needed to develop a detailed Specific Plan (including location and intensity of land uses, circulation system, infrastructure, services, and financing plan as well as design guidelines and other implementation features) and must involve a Community Task Force.
- f) The major policy features of the Specific Plan should be incorporated into the General Plan in the form of the Coyote Valley Planned Community designation.

Sal explained that the General Plan sets a number of conditions, or “triggers” that must be met before the City Council may adopt a Specific Plan, and before any residential zonings are approved. The triggers include:

- a) 5,000 new jobs (+ the existing 2,000 jobs that existed as of 1990).
- b) The City’s fiscal condition must be stable and predictable in the long term. This must be based on:
 - i) A 5-year economic forecast for the City, which projects a balanced budget or a budget surplus for each of the forecast years.
 - ii) City Services must be at least at the same level as they were in 1993 through out the City.
 - iii) The City’s basic fiscal relationship with the State or other levels of government must be stable during the five-year economic forecast.

These prerequisite conditions, or “triggers,” should only be modified during a comprehensive update of the General Plan involving a community task force similar to the San Jose 2020 General Plan update process.

In addition, there shall be no urban residential development in the North and Mid-Coyote Valley before the Specific Plan is adopted.

The General Plan land use designation for the North Coyote is Campus Industrial, and Agriculture, Rural Residential and Private Recreation in the Urban Reserve. The Greenbelt is an overlay designation that is proposed to be a permanent, non-urban buffer between San Jose and Morgan Hill. Land use designations within the Greenbelt include Agriculture, Public Parks/Open Space, Private Recreation and Public Quasi-Public.

The North Coyote Valley Campus Industrial Area Master Plan (see handout) was adopted in 1985, and amended in 1999, and in 2000. It does three things:

- a) Reinforces the City’s goals for development in the North Coyote Valley.

- b) Sets the development standards for major public infrastructure.
- c) Sets standards required to implement private development.

Eric Carruthers asked how much land area there was in the Private Recreation designation other than the Coyote Creek Golf Course. Sal indicated that he would get that information for him. The Task Force also asked about the specific services referenced by the "1993 service level" trigger. Laurel Prevetti - Deputy Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement - responded by saying that the policy specifically refers to certain City services throughout the City. These services, identified in the San Jose 2020 General Plan, include police response time, police personnel per capita, fire response time, fire personnel per capita, library books per capita, library floor space per capita, hours open at the main and branch libraries and community center floor space per capita. She also indicated that 2 years ago the City prepared an update for the City Council which and it concluded that services had not diminished below the 1993 levels

Sal introduced Anne Draper, Director of the Santa Clara County Planning Department, who presented information regarding the Coyote Greenbelt. She indicated that Santa Clara County, the City of San Jose, and the City of Morgan Hill have worked on a collaborative effort to provide a vision for the Coyote Greenbelt. She referred to the two handouts that were provided - the "Draft Coyote Valley Greenbelt: Implementation Challenges" and the "Coyote Valley Greenbelt Appendices," as the key products of that collaboration.

Anne indicated that 26% of the Greenbelt is in public ownership, and observed that the properties in public ownership are mostly the least developed, while those in private ownership are the most developed. She indicated that that without additional subdivisions another 250 housing units could be built in the Greenbelt. Though most of the Greenbelt is in County jurisdiction, various portions of it, especially along Monterey Road, have already been annexed into San Jose. The Greenbelt has a unique shape with a long narrow segment on the east of Coyote Creek north of Palm Avenue, and contains sensitive habitats and aquifer recharge areas. There are riparian areas and wildlife migration corridors, which should be protected. The Greenbelt also has a lot of "gateways" and "edges," and many creeks and transportation corridors bisect it.

Anne stated that there are many other agencies that have a role in the protection of the Greenbelt, and indicated that the County and City of Morgan Hill have already adopted resolutions in support of the Greenbelt Planning Principles. In response to a question about when the latter would be brought to the City Council for consideration, Laurel Prevetti indicated that would probably be in December.

5. Progress Report #6: Traffic

Gary Black of Hexagon Transportation Consultants was introduced and provided an update on existing traffic conditions using a power-point slide show. He indicated that Route 101 was widened from 4 to 8 lanes in the spring, and it has resulted in a 15-minute decrease in travel time and big decreases in traffic on Monterey Road and on Santa Teresa Road. He explained the City's Level of Service Policy and that it is a range of Level A-F with Level D being the City's least acceptable level. All intersections in the Coyote Valley are currently meeting the acceptable Level of Service standard D. He explained that potential project impacts to relevant intersections in the City of Morgan Hill will be studied during the course of the Specific Plan, and that the current study involved "existing conditions" only. Transportation improvement models will also be developed for Coyote Valley. Potential traffic concerns are: 1) the adequacy of the existing system to serve the other planned developments south of and within the Coyote Valley (how much capacity the planned infrastructure system will have beyond the Campus Industrial); 2) the timing of Campus Industrial development and its associated improvements; and 3) the adequacy of Highway 101 north and south of the Coyote Valley

Gary identified the following improvement opportunities: 1) internalization of trips within the Coyote Valley (the possibility of living and working in the Coyote Valley so people don't have to drive a long ways to and from work); 2) new freeway interchanges at Coyote Valley Parkway, Bailey Avenue, and the Coyote Creek Golf Course Drive, 2) Public transportation (Caltrain, light rail transit and park and ride), and 3) improved arterial streets. Finally, he indicated that a traffic analysis would be prepared for the EIR.

The Task Force asked some questions regarding land use, traffic impacts, and the analysis of alternative modes of transportation. In response, Gary indicated that the City's transportation model includes the tools to estimate biking, walking etc and their success in this area. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) also does travel surveys, which are used to establish relationships and to analyze proximity to transit and the likelihood of using it. He stated that another method is to study other built communities to understand the concept of internalized trips and their practical effects. He indicated that, in addition to proximity, the attractiveness of transit also depends on how well lit and safe the public transportation facilities are. Co-Chair Ron Gonzales commented that there was a great opportunity to create linkages to the existing Coyote Creek Trail and plan the community around the trail system. He also wants the analysis to show how the Coyote transportation system fits with the whole City's transportation network. The Task Force also asked about the Level of Service standards of other mobility modes, such as walking and biking. Gary indicated that the City did not have LOS standards for all of these other modes, but that there are industry standards and other policies of good design that can be used to guide the planning and design of traffic systems. Another question involved how to maintain the existing pedestrian-friendly feeling in Coyote Valley Specific Plan. Gary indicated that there has been a shift in the City's attitude recently toward street design that is more respectful of all modes of travel, not just vehicular travel. There were also comments about the importance of getting people

out of their cars, and the preservation and protection of the trails while encouraging their use.

6. Progress Report #7: Hydrology

Chuck Anderson of Schaaf and Wheeler presented a power-point slide show on hydrology, which he defined as the study of water and its relationship to the environment. He gave an overview of the environmental setting of the Coyote Valley and explained the five primary hydrologic issues of the area: drainage, flooding, groundwater, basin balance and water quality. Chuck stated that the Coyote Creek watershed is 205 square miles, all draining north through Coyote Valley out to San Francisco Bay. There is also a bottleneck near Tulare hill as the water heads out of Coyote Valley to the north to the bay. Fisher Creek's is 16 square miles west of Monterey Highway and the railroad corridor. The Coyote Canal, located east of Coyote Creek, leads to the "narrows" and it is an important drainage/water conveyance management tool in Coyote Valley. The natural flow of the water is from Coyote Creek toward Fisher Creek. When you add buildings and hardscape you increase drainage and water velocity. The mitigation plan for the North Coyote Campus Industrial area is predicated on not increasing the amount of surface runoff to the south. Groundwater acts in ways similar to above ground waters, and where the water narrows above ground it does the same thing underground. Cochrane Road is the dividing line for the watershed between waters flowing to the San Francisco Bay and the Pajaro basin. Coyote Valley can be thought of like a bathtub with "Coyote Narrows" as the drain and the Anderson Reservoir as the spigot into the Coyote Valley. Regarding basin imbalance, Chuck explained that 85% of the recharge to the basin is from surface water. We pump 8,000 acre- feet out of the ground per year. Coyote Creek recharges the ground water basin. The water going in is now higher than the amount going out, so groundwater is on the rise. This basin is really responsive to the amount of water that is put in or taken out. Regarding the quality of surface water, the potential concerns involve agricultural and urban runoff. Nitrate, which is a bi-product of fertilizer, is of prime importance in water quality. Agricultural runoff and septic systems are being monitored by the Water District in certain problem areas in the Greenbelt in the south. One of the benefits of the conversion of agricultural lands to urban use is the potential for the reduction of nitrate runoff. With regard to the surface water the North Coyote area has a mitigation plan and the Urban Reserve area may be able to be developed with a similar mitigation plan. There are some potential hydrological concerns for future development in Coyote. These include: 1) Mitigation of urban runoff and peak discharges; 2) Preservation of floodplain storage, and 3) Maintenance of basin balance. Chuck identified the future tasks as detailed Watershed modeling, and the preparation of floodplain impact mitigation plans.

The Task Force asked questions about floodplain mitigation plans, non-pervious surfaces, and the Anderson Reservoir. In response, Chuck indicated that they typically address best management practices. On non-pervious surfaces he explained that at least 10-15 % or more of the land needs to remain pervious for the flood plain mitigation to work. Chuck indicated that future development would be consistent with the C-3 Provision and other strict water quality and hydro modification regulations. About the potential use of Anderson Reservoir as a major metering

device, where natural surface runoff becomes an issue only after the Reservoir is full, Chuck explained that the Water District operates the Reservoir for water supply than for flood control.

7. Public Comments

Joe Burch, a resident the Redwood Empire area, questioned how the Task Force will be dealing with property owners that have existing use permits and whether there would be a provision for a grandfather clause. Co-chair Forrest Williams advised him to maintain his current use permit in good standing and referred him to Laurel Prevetti for additional questions. There were no other public comments.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at about 7:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for December 8, 2003, and the one following is January 12, 2004.