

MH 2035 GP+RDCS DEIR comments (due 3/14)\_DMuirhead  
From: D. Muirhead [doug.muirhead@stanfordalumni.org]  
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 1:38 PM  
To: John Baty  
Subject: MH 2035 GP+RDCS DEIR comments (due 3/14)

Senior Planner John Baty,  
Here are some minor comments for the Morgan Hill 2035 DEIR dated January 13, 2016 with the comment period ending March 14, 2016. Sadly, I only got through page 281 of 732.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Doug Muirhead, Morgan Hill

-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+  
-+  
Please replace the word "appurtenant" in the GP and EIR with a common vocabulary word.

-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+  
-+  
TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

UTIL-1: Sufficient water supplies would be available to LTS/LTS N/A serve the proposed Project from existing entitlements and resources and new or expanded entitlements would not be required.

[comment] According to the SCVWD South County Water Supply Planing Project, dated July 2010, referenced in Todd Groundwater Screening Level Assessment included in South County Recycled Water Master Plan Update 2015, groundwater demands will increase by about 7000 AFY by 2030 and between 4000 and 16000 AFY of additional water supplies would be needed to meet groundwater management objectives and a reliable water supply.

-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+  
-+  
TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS  
UTIL-11: The proposed Project would result in a LTS/LTS N/A substantial increase in natural gas and electrical service demands, would use appropriate energy conservation and efficiency measures, and would not require new energy supply facilities and distribution

[comment] while I have heard Planning Commission and Council discussions about the supply of industrial land (often based on a new consultant study), I have never heard a discussion about whether we will have enough power. One of the benefits PG&E advertises for their South County Power Connect is that it responds to projections that we will need more power for residential and industrial use. When I asked at their recent open house where their forecasts came from, they said CalISO. But they also said they had recently met with City staff to get Morgan Hill input.  
If the City has projections, what are they?  
If the City foresees limitations, what are they?

-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+  
-+  
3.2.1 LOCATION  
Additional access is provided by the Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) Bus Service, which provides bus service between the Morgan Hill Caltrain Station and the Monterey Transit Plaza in Monterey.

[comment] MST actually continues north into San Jose, serving SJSU.

-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+  
-+  
3.2.2 EXISTING LAND USE

MH 2035 GP+RDCS DEIR comments (due 314)\_DMuirhead  
Significant parts of the City may appear vacant, including large parcels in the industrial areas of the City.  
...residential parcels that have received RDCS allocations may appear vacant, but in fact have pending development.

[comment] The City of Morgan Hill submitted information on the City's vacant lands as part of its LAFCO USA amendment application material. The maps and vacant lands data / reports submitted by the City are included in Appendix Z of the March 11 hearing staff report. Using the City's information, LAFCO staff prepared a vacant lands inventory that describes the current supply of vacant land within the City's existing boundaries as Appendix X. This might go well with 3.4.4.2 PROPOSED PLANNING BOUNDARY CHANGES, Table 3-2, the horizon-year 2035 projection for net growth

### 3.2.3 SURROUNDING LAND USE Chesbro Reservoir County Park to the west.

[comment] I always thought that Chesbro was just a Water District reservoir. So thanks for the education.

3.4.1 PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN OBJECTIVES  
13 Guiding Principles outline the objectives of the proposed General Plan.  
7. Provide high-quality internet connectivity.

[comment] This has never made sense. Other than City Government intranet and two public access TV channels through the Cable TV franchise agreement with Charter Communications, all internet connectivity is controlled by commercial non-public entities. The City didn't even put in dark fiber as part of Downtown utility undergrounding.

-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+  
-+  
3.4.2 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS  
[M]ore than 20 GPAC meetings, and four community workshops have been held  
during the planning process, all of which were open to the public and included  
public comment periods.

[comment] The GPAC meetings were not recorded, so there is no reviewable record.

-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+  
-+  
3.4.2.6 PUBLIC REVIEW AND ADOPTION  
The remaining tasks of the General Plan Update process will include the review and adoption of final documents and the certification of this EIR. This phase includes the 60-day public review period of this EIR.

[comment] What is the schedule for the EIR for the infrastructure plans? What is the linkage between the infrastructure master plans and the General Plan and its EIR?

Joanna Jansen, at the February 23 meeting of the Planning Commission to receive comments on the draft GP EIR, stated that the infrastructure master plans were not complete enough to be covered in this EIR, so that a subsequent CEQA document will be required.

CEQA document will be required.

**From 3.6.5 ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED RDCS IN THIS EIR**

Projects successive to this EIR include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Updates to the City's Municipal Service Review and Comprehensive Annexation

MH 2035 GP+RDCS DEIR comments (due 314)\_DMuirhead  
Plan, and other utility infrastructure master plans, such as the Water,  
Wastewater, Stormwater, and Telecommunications Master Plans.  
Note that there are also the Parks and Trails Master Plan and the Public  
Safety Master Plan.

### 3.5.1.4 OPPORTUNITY SITES input from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

[comment] I obtained the members of the TAC via PRR. You should identify them.

**3.6.1 PROPOSED RDGS OBJECTIVES**  
Overall, the RDGS promotes an orderly, efficient, and sustainable residential development pattern and provides certainty to residents that residential development patterns will reflect local goals and values.

[comment] At the Council Goals workshop in January 2013, when Council member Siebert expressed a desire for neighborhood associations, Council member Carr responded that our piece-at-a-time development policy discourages that. And I believe that the Planning Commission had an example last year where part of a project was built and an HOA was formed. The remainder of the project was purchased by a different developer and the new plans were objected to by the existing residents.

4.1 AESTHETICS 4.1.1.1 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK City's Planning Division staff routes projects to the Design Review Committee. City's Design Review process, which is established in Section 18.74 of the City's Municipal Code

[comment] I can find no reference to the Design Review Committee in the Municipal Code. And it has not been mentioned in the Planning Commission design workshops and discussion about the Architectural Review Handbook.

--  
4.1.3 IMPACT DISCUSSION  
AES-3 Implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. To some people, this change in appearance from agricultural or rural residential landscapes to land developed with attractive neighborhoods, parks, and schools would be a deterioration of the visual character, while others may consider it an improvement.  
General Plan Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.  
RDCS Significance Before Mitigation: No impact.

[comment] So those people who hold the view that this is a deterioration are ignored?

-+  
4.3 AIR QUALITY  
4.3.3 IMPACT DISCUSSION  
AQ-1 Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with or  
obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.  
proposed General Plan would reduce VMT per population and VMT per service  
population (SP, defined as residents and employees).

MH 2035 GP+RDCS DEIR comments (due 314)\_DMuirhead  
[comment] And yet we are encouraging large numbers of people in the region to drive to Morgan Hill for Sports Tourism.

---

-+  
4.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY

4.6.1.1 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The City of Morgan Hill lies

within the jurisdiction of both the San Francisco Bay RWQCB (Region 2) and the Central Coast Bay RWQCB (Region 3) and is subject to the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) of the Phase II Small MS4 Permit.

The northern portion of Morgan Hill and the sphere of influence (SOI) lies within the jurisdiction of San Francisco Bay RWQCB (Region 2), which covers watersheds that drain primarily into San Francisco Bay.

The Central Coast RWQCB (Region 3) covers the state's central coast, including most of Morgan Hill and its SOI. The watersheds within the Central Coast RWQCB jurisdiction drain primarily into the Pacific Ocean.

[comment] That we are subject to San Francisco Bay RWQCB is news to me. We partner with Gilroy and the County to comply with the Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan authorized by the Central Coast Bay RWQCB. And the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit issued by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB list of jurisdictions includes cities from San Jose to the north county border plus the County and SCVWD; collectively, those cities implement the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP).

[end as of page 281 of 732]