



Memorandum

TO: COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC
PLAN TASK FORCE

FROM: Sal Yakubu

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
MEETING HELD ON 7/29/04

DATE: August 23, 2004

Approved

Date

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Kyle Simpson (Greenbelt Alliance), David Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Bill Shoe (Santa Clara County), Beverly Bryant (HBANC), Robert Mansfield (San Jose State University-Urban Planning Department), Mike Griffiths (County Roads and Airports), Dunia Noel (LAFCO), Carolyn McKennan (Morgan Hill Unified School District), Dawn Cameron (County Roads and Airports), Mike Tasosa (Valley Transportation Authority), Julie Render (Valley Transportation Authority), Jane Mark (County Parks and Recreation), Sandra Paim (Historic Landmarks Commission), Rebecca Van Dahlen (Santa Clara County Association of Realtors), Mary Hughes (Silicon Valley Habitat for Humanity), Vivian Smith (Saint Louise Regional Hospital), Mark Frederick (County parks and Recreation), Kathryn Nation (Senator Bruce McPherson's Office), and Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills).

City and Other Public Agency Staff Present:

Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Dave Mitchell (PRNS) and Bill Miller (SJPD).

Consultants and Members of the Public:

Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group) and Sean Morley.

1. Welcome and Introductions:

The meeting convened at 3:10 p.m. with introductions around the room. Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the City Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, reviewed the background of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan and the City Council Vision and brought everyone up to date on the planning process.

2. Discussion and Comments on the Focal Lake Concept, approach and strategies for the CVSP, and Evaluation Criteria:

Focal Lake Concept:

Sal introduced Jim Thompson of HMM Engineers who explained the hydrology and flood control features of the conceptual lake design. Jim also explained the objectives, components, facility costs, technical design issues, water source feasibility maintenance and regulatory issues of the lake concept. He explained that advance treated recycled water would be used for the lake and that a geotechnical membrane is proposed to prevent any mixture of lake water with groundwater.

Jim indicated that the 60-acre lake would require about 250 acre-feet of water per year due to evaporation (with a demand for up to 20,000 acre-feet of water per year for Coyote sub-basin) and explained how the conceptual swim lagoon would operate. He indicated that the conceptual design would require that all storm water would be treated through a bio-filtration prior to it entering the lake. TAC members asked/made the following questions and comments:

- Recommendation that the plan should provide small islands in the lake for wildlife habitat.
- What is the source of water would be for the lake. *Jim responded that it would be advance-treated recycled water.*
- *Concern expressed that the use of groundwater for the lake could adversely impact to Coyote Creek.*

Approach and Strategies for CVSP:

The TAC asked about the status of planning for the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt. Sal Yakubu indicated that City staff and the consultant team have had two meetings with the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt property owners, with the last one attracting about 160 people. He indicated that the CVSP staff and consultants will continue to look at options for preservation of the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt area as a permanent non-urban buffer with the assistance of Sibella Krause, a specialist in agricultural viability.

Sal stated that the property owners were told that there are no plans to extend urban services into the Greenbelt area, which is outside of the City's Urban Growth Boundary located at Palm

Avenue. He also added that there are no plans to change the Urban Growth Boundary, and that changes would have to be approved by a vote of the electorate.

The TAC had the following comments:

- Recommendation for the development of a “vision for the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt area.”
- Concern that there needs to be some parameters developed as to what is developable within the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt.
- Recommendation that the property owners in the North and the Mid-Coyote area should help finance the preservation of the South Coyote Greenbelt as a permanent non-urban buffer.
- The City of Morgan Hill does not envision more development in the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt area.
- The term Greenbelt gives the impression that the South Coyote Valley area has no value.
- The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt will have more value as a result of the Specific Plan than currently exists.
- The Dougherty Avenue area is not that visible from the valley floor and therefore more development in that area would not have a visual impact.
- There needs to be an understanding that the property owners have the ability to construct homes on individual lots.
- The City of San Jose’s Parks Department’s preference is for little or no development in the area between Monterey Road and Highway 101, with most development occurring on the west side of Monterey Road.
- Highway 101, Monterey Road, and Santa Teresa Blvd are major corridors, which should be afforded view sheds and open space protection.
- A fee should be charged to the urban area property owners to help fund the acquisition of open space lands in the South Coyote Greenbelt area.
- The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt area could become a new Hillsborough due to the estate-sized lots, which exist in the area.
- What does value means to property owners?
- Land has a high speculative value when pending land use decisions are in flux.
- According to the Morgan Hill Unified School District, the cost of the new schools in the Coyote Valley is estimated to be \$400-500 million (for construction only, not including the land value).
- Will land be set aside for schools?
- Schools will need to be in place before the residents arrive.
- Developing multi-story high schools is very expensive and may not be appropriate.
- There are currently 8,900 students in the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD) system.
- According to the Santa Clara Valley Water District, habitat enhancement and recharge ponds are very important to the ecosystem, and should be included in the CVSP.
- Recharge areas should be considered in the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt.

Evaluation Criteria:

The TAC made comments on the following evaluation criteria:

- Ecological Sustainability - In measuring ecological sustainability, the City should be look at a broader area than just Coyote Valley.
- Social Equity - There should be an equitable distribution of parks and trails.
- Accessibility is an important issue for the disabled, and should be appropriately dealt covered in the CVSP.
- Healthy Lifestyle - that the intent of this criterion should be clarified, and public safety should be included in it.
- Traffic Impacts within the Surrounding Coyote Valley – We also need to look at regional impacts, not just within Coyote Valley.
- How does traffic model work and to what extent will traffic impacts outside Coyote Valley be considered.
- Social Equity - There needs to be a balance in density and zoning to ensure that schools are viable individually.
- There needs to be a balance ethnically and economically.
- Parks should be located near schools.
- Walkability - Curbs and sidewalks should be designed for easy accessibility and concern that ADA requirements be met
- Comment that a 1-inch curb is a deterrent for motorized wheel chairs)

3. Open Forum/Next Steps:

Sal Yakubu explained the next steps in the process, indicated that the next TAC meeting would be on August 19, 2004 and encouraged all of the TAC members to attend the next Task Force and Community Workshop on Saturday, August 14, 2004.

Brian Schmidt, of the Committee for Green Foothills, submitted a letter dated July 29, 2004, which questions the adequacy of the proposed number of housing units. The letter indicated that 11,000 to 27,000 homes may be needed outside of Coyote Valley to meet the demand created by the 50K new jobs in Coyote Valley. He asked staff to review the concerns raised in the letter.

4. Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.