

City of San José
Coyote Valley Specific Plan

**Summary of Task Force Meeting
December 11, 2006
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, Russ Danielson, Craige Edgerton, Supervisor Don Gage, Dan Hancock, Melissa Hippard, Doreen Morgan, Ken Saso, Steve Speno, and Neil Struthers.

Task Force Members Absent

Pat Dando, Gladwyn D'Souza, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Chris Platten, Steve Schott, Jr

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present

Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), David Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Dawn Cameron (Consultant for County Roads), Mike Griffis (Consultant for County Roads), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present

Frances Grammer (Council District 2), Scarlett Lam (Council District 2), Lee Wilcox (Council District 10), Rachel Gibson (Office of Supervisor Don Gage), Colleen Valles (Office of Supervisor Don Gage), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Stefanie Hom (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Matt Krupp (ESD), and Dave Mitchell (PRNS).

Consultants Present

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Jodi Starbird (David J Powers), Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers), 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.)

Shiloh Ballard, Pete Benson, Mike Biggar, Julie Ceballos, Roger Costa, Frank Crane, Jim Doyle, Robert Eltgroth, Mary Figone, Janet Hebert, Paul Hebert, Virginia Holtz, Sarah Muller, Peter Rothschild, Annie Saso, George Thomas, Jr., Shelle Thomas, Al Victors, Don Weden, and Kim Weden.

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at 5:34 p.m. with Co-Chair Councilmember Forrest Williams welcoming everyone to the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meeting.

2. Acceptance of October 30, 2006 Task Force Meeting Summary

Co-chair Councilmember Nancy Pyle called for a motion to accept the October 30, 2006 Task Force meeting summary. Ken Saso indicated that he was in attendance at the meeting. Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams indicated that the summary will be corrected accordingly. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Discussion of the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams introduced Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director for the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement. The meeting is intended to provide the Task Force with an opportunity to discuss the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan.

Laurel indicated that the Initial Draft of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan is posted the CVSP website, and the document is also available on CD from CVSP staff at no charge. Laurel explained that a Specific Plan is more detailed planning of specific areas within San Jose. The document indicates specific uses, design, phasing, and financing provisions. The major features of the specific plan would be incorporated into the General Plan.

The Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan is also basis for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which is expected to be released on March 1, 2007, with plan refinements to follow. The Specific Plan is still a working draft and plan refinements are expected over the next few months. There may be some differences between the Planning Area Detail Appendix and the Initial Draft Land Use Plan. The Initial Draft Land Use Plan is more conservative to be consistent with the project description in the EIR. Where there are notable variations between the two land use concepts, the Initial Draft Land Use Plan has precedence to maintain the integrity of the EIR.

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

are shown first, followed by responses in italics):

- Does the Specific Plan carry a level of commitment to property owners and developers? *Laurel indicated that it will carry the same weight and be as binding as the City's General Plan.*
- What is the purpose of "objective" and "policy"? *Laurel indicated there is a hierarchy of goals they are trying to achieve. An objective indicates specific goals that are to be achieved, and the policies provide the specifics on how to achieve the stated objectives.*
- Do the policies have force of law if the document is adopted by the City Council? *Laurel indicated the City Council will consider the approval of the Specific Plan and zoning. Yes, the specific plan will carry the same force of law as the City's General Plan. When developers file applications with the City, the Planning Department would review their proposals for compliance with the Specific Plan policies and the other policies of the General Plan.*
- Are some of the land-uses in the Initial Draft more conservative in the densities than the Planning Area Detail Appendix? *Laurel indicated there may be some differences and they will be considering those during the plan refinement process.*
- If the Specific Plan changes, will the EIR change? *The goal is to prepare the EIR in a way that provides an envelope to work within. The EIR would also analyze alternatives.*
- Will the Initial Draft Specific Plan have the highest densities, and then be scaled back in the refinements? *No, the Initial Draft reflects the densities of the land use concept presented to the City Council in January 2006. It is important that the project description stay stable in order to complete the EIR. The Task Force will see variations on the Plan through the alternative process.*
- Will the alternatives address the options? *Yes.*

Laurel introduced Ken Kay from KenKay Associates. Ken went over the major elements of the Plan, which is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan. The Plan starts with the "Environmental Footprint" of Coyote Valley. It identifies three levels of natural resources sensitivity: fixed (conservation/preservation), flexible (restoration and enhancement), and lesser significance (balance with economics).

From the Environmental Footprint comes a series of overlays of other infrastructure elements, known as the Composite Framework. The Composite Framework helps to define the public realm. There are three components: blue infrastructure, green infrastructure, and mobility infrastructure. The blue infrastructure includes a 55-acre lake, the urban canal, Fisher Creek, Laguna Seca detention basins, and Parkway Loop and Monterey Road. The green infrastructure includes a network of parks, open space, recreation and multi-use trails that make a community livable. The mobility infrastructure is a network of the in-Valley transit, parkway and the grided streets and boulevards. The mobility priorities in the Coyote Valley Specific Plan are: 1. pedestrians, 2. bicycles, 3. transit, 4. carpools, and 5. single occupant vehicles.

Ken showed several images of the Central Commons. It would be an urban to rural transect that would accommodate different modes of transportation. A form-based code would implement the Central Commons concept.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments. (Please note that comments are shown first, followed by responses in italics):

- Will there be information on the impacts to parks and trails? *Yes, more information will be available in the EIR.*

Doug Dahlin, with the Dahlin Group, went over several sections of the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan, emphasizing innovative features. He started with Section 5, Land Use and Urban Design. There are many innovative land-use features of the Plan that would make Coyote Valley a unique community, including the creation of an urban density, an integrated environment, mixed-use buildings, contribution to the regional job balance, urban living in close proximity to nature, and the use of green building design.

Section 7 of the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan details community facilities and services. The CVSP community facilities are intended to create civic celebration and support for higher education and lifelong learning. Some innovative features include the integration of schools and parks, storefront public services, shared parking, and pedestrian mobility and transit connectivity to schools and services.

Section 9 indicates strategies for the Greenbelt and open space areas of Coyote Valley. Doug indicated that the Greenbelt will be a non-urban buffer between the City of San Jose and Morgan Hill. However, there would be integrated trail access from urban areas to open space, and there would be a small scale and urban edge agricultural strategy.

Section 10 indicates how the CVSP would be implemented. Innovative implementation features include the creation of an affordable housing strategy to meet a 20% affordable housing threshold, and the use of a form-based zoning code. The Plan would be self-funding, and is intended to contribute to the City of San Jose's jobs-housing balance.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments. (Please note that comments are shown first, followed by responses in italics):

- What is the difference between the words "promote," "provide," and "create"? Who decides how the words are used? *Doug clarified that "promote" means to encourage; it is not regulatory. The word "provide" means that something is to be provided on the site. The word "create" means that it should be implemented as indicated in the Plan. Laurel indicated that some of the words are used for variety, but the goal is to achieve everything in the Plan. Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams added that the City Council's adopted Vision and Expected Outcomes specifies that some policies are absolute in order to meet the goals, and some policies are encouraged to allow for flexibility.*
- The Plan should be flexible to accommodate employment uses. Does not want the Plan to preclude potential employers. Some land-uses should be condensed. *This is work to be done during the Plan refinement phase.*
- Does the Plan include information about form-based zoning and phasing? *Laurel indicated*

that the phasing strategy is still under discussion and will be included in the Implementation Section of the Plan when it is completed. The form-based code will be a separate document that will be more detailed.

- Does the Plan include information on maintaining groundwater? *Laurel indicated that information on hydrology is located on pg. 121 of the Initial Draft Specific Plan.*
- Impressed with the graphics.
- Suggested the Plan should require environmental stewardship, not just encourage it.
- Are the “guiding principles” direction to staff? *Laurel indicated the Plan is developed around the City Council Vision and Expected Outcomes, and that the guiding principles just expand on the Vision.*
- The “guiding principles” should encourage major corporate users to locate in Coyote Valley.
- Are the “guiding principles” for developing the Plan, or for getting permits? *Laurel indicated the “guiding principles” apply to both.*
- Appreciates information about schools, and will share this with the Morgan Hill Unified School District.
- Thanked consultants and staff for the presentation. The Co-chair councilmembers will need to sell the Plan to the City Council.
- Next year is the fifth year of work on the Plan. The document represents four years of work and represents how advanced the Plan is. The efforts have been innovative and extraordinary. Need to move on to the next phase now.
- Few people know about the development of Coyote Valley. Suggested making a stronger effort to reach more people. The more people that understand the Plan, the less fear there is. Presentations should be more concise with good graphics and less than 30 minutes long. Would like to see consultants develop a creative presentation.
- Would like to see more information on wildlife in the appendices. A lot of wildlife will be displaced.
- Concerned about the ballfields in Laguna Seca since it is a habitat for migratory wild birds.
- City staff and consultants are not able to stop work on the Plan. The City Council gave direction to provide a Specific Plan and EIR for Coyote Valley.
- The Plan needs to be on a global scale.
- The Coyote Valley Specific Plan is an opportunity to do some branding on San Jose. It will not displace other activities elsewhere in San Jose.
- Coyote Valley is similar to Santana Row. The City did not make any investment in Santana Row, but it is very successful. The same can happen in Coyote Valley.

Laurel indicated they will be accepting comments on the Initial Draft Coyote Valley Specific Plan. She also invited the Task Force to the City Council Study Session on Friday, December 15, 2006, located at the San Jose City Hall Council Chambers.

4. Public Comments

- Frank Crane, representing the Mikami Family, is concerned about the new City leadership. Would like the plan to keep moving; if the Plan does not go forward, something else will develop in Coyote Valley.

5. 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 7:12 p.m.

The next Task Force meeting will take place on January 22, 2007.

Y:\CVSP Mtgs_TASKFORCE\Meeting
Summary\TF_51_01.22.07\TaskForce_Meeting_#51_12.11.06_Task_Force_Meeting.doc