

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 4

P.O. BOX 23660

OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660

PHONE (510) 286-5528

FAX (510) 286-5559

TTY 711

www.dot.ca.gov

Serious Drought.
Help save water!

July 6, 2015

SCLVAR062
SCL/VAR/PM VAR
SCH# 2015062013

Ms. Amber El-Hajj
Planning Division
City of Sunnyvale
456 West Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Dear Ms. El-Hajj:

Peery Park Specific Plan – Notice of Preparation (NOP)

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The Caltrans District 4 Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities of infill, conservationism, and efficient development. We have reviewed the NOP and have the following comments to offer. We provide these comments consistent with the State's smart mobility goals to support a vibrant economy and build communities, not sprawl.

Project Understanding

Peery Park is an existing light industrial district approximately 446 net acres in area with 223 parcels ranging between 0.02 and 21.45 acres in size and approximately 7 million square feet (sf) of existing development with 0.5 million sf approved or under construction. The Specific Plan (Project) would guide future development addressing the type, location, intensity, and design of industrial and commercial buildings, as well as transportation and infrastructure improvements.

Lead Agency

As the lead agency, the City of Sunnyvale (City) is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to State highways. The project's fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)

The environmental document should include an analysis of the travel demand expected from the proposed project. Caltrans is in the process of updating its *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic*

Ms. Amber El-Hajj/City of Sunnyvale
July 6, 2015
Page 2

Impact Studies (TIS Guide) for consistency with Senate Bill 743, but meanwhile we recommend using the Caltrans TIS Guide for determining which scenarios and methodologies to use in the analysis, available at: http://dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/igr_ceqa_files/tisguide.pdf.

Please ensure that a TIA is prepared providing the information detailed below:

1. Vicinity map, regional location map, and a site plan clearly showing project access in relation to nearby State roadways. Ingress and egress for all project components should be clearly identified. Clearly identify the State right-of-way (ROW). Project driveways, local roads and intersections, car/bike parking, and transit facilities should be mapped.
2. Project-related trip generation, distribution, and assignment including per capita use of transit, rideshare or active transportation modes such as existing bus service; new bus service, such as service to major transit centers like the Sunnyvale Caltrain Station; and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction factors. The assumptions and methodologies used to develop this information should be detailed in the study, utilize the latest place-based research, and be supported with appropriate documentation.
3. 2035 Cumulative Conditions and 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.
4. The project site building potential as identified in the General Plan. The project's consistency with both the Circulation Element of the General Plan and the Congestion Management Agency's Congestion Management Plan should be evaluated.
5. Schematic illustration of walking, biking and auto conditions at the project site and study area roadways, trip distribution percentages and volumes as well as intersection geometrics, (i.e., lane configurations, for AM and PM peak periods). Potential safety issues for all road users should be identified and fully mitigated.
6. Mitigation for any roadway sections or intersection with increasing VMT should be identified. Mitigation may include contributions to the regional fee program as applicable (described below), and should support the use of transit and active transportation modes. Because of the location of the project, Caltrans recommends the City consider mitigation measure options which would allow the City to ensure that direct and indirect traffic impacts, as well as the contribution to cumulative traffic impacts, from the project are mitigated to the extent feasible. Potential mitigation measures that include the requirements of other agencies such as Caltrans are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally-binding instruments under the control of the City.
7. The project's effect on pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit performance should be based on any projected resulting VMT increases and evaluating mitigation measures and tradeoffs. The analysis should describe any pedestrian and bicycle mitigation measures and safety countermeasures that would be needed as a means of maintaining and improving access to transit facilities and reducing vehicle trips.

Ms. Amber El-Hajj/City of Sunnyvale
July 6, 2015
Page 4

public transportation facilities necessitated by development. Scheduling and costs associated with planned improvements on State ROW should be listed, in addition to identifying viable funding sources correlated to the pace of improvements for roadway improvements, if any.

State Route (SR) 237 and U.S. Highway (U.S.) 101 are critical to regional and interregional traffic in the San Francisco Bay region. They are vital to commuting, freight, and recreational traffic. Given the scale and location of the proposed project at the junction of these two vital facilities and the traffic generated, along with other projects in the vicinity (e.g., the Moffett Park Specific Plan, Moffett Place, 215 Moffett Park Drive, the N. Mathilda Avenue/SR 237 interchange improvement project), this project is likely to have a significant regional impact to the State Highway System.

Voluntary Contribution Program

Caltrans encourages the City to participate in the VTA's voluntary contribution program and plan for the impact of future growth on the regional transportation system. Contributions by the City funding regional transportation programs would improve the transportation system to lessen future traffic congestion, improve mobility by reducing time delays, and maintain reliability on major roadways throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. Reducing delays on State facilities will not only benefit the region, but also reduce any queuing on local roadways caused by highway congestion.

Cultural Resources

Caltrans requires that a project's environmental document include documentation of a current archaeological record search from the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System if construction activities are proposed within State ROW. Current record searches must be no more than five years old. Caltrans requires the records search, and if warranted, a cultural resource study by a qualified, professional archaeologist, and evidence of Native American consultation to ensure compliance with CEQA, Section 5024.5 and 5097 of the California Public Resources Code, and Volume 2 of Caltrans' Standard Environmental Reference (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/vol2/vol2.htm>).

These requirements, including applicable mitigation, must be fulfilled before an encroachment permit can be issued for project-related work in State ROW. Work subject to these requirements includes, but is not limited to: lane widening, channelization, auxiliary lanes, and/or modification of existing features such as slopes, drainage features, curbs, sidewalks and driveways within or adjacent to State ROW.

Transportation Management Plan (TMP)

If it is determined that traffic restrictions and detours are needed on or which may affect State highways, a TMP or construction TIA may be required for approval by Caltrans prior to construction. Traffic Management Plans must be prepared in accordance with Caltrans' *TMP Guidelines*. Further information is available for download at the following web address: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trafmgmt/tmp_lcs/index.htm.

Ms. Amber El-Hajj/City of Sunnyvale
July 6, 2015
Page 5

Please ensure that such plans are also prepared in accordance with the TMP requirements of the corresponding jurisdictions. For further TMP assistance, please contact the Caltrans District 4 Office of Traffic Management Operations at (510) 286-4579.

Encroachment Permit

Please be advised that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the State ROW requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to: David Salladay, District Office Chief, Office of Permits, California Department of Transportation, District 4, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. See this website for more information:
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits>.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Brian Ashurst at (510) 286-5505 or brian.ashurst@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

- c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse
Robert Swierk, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) – electronic copy
Robert Cunningham, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) – electronic copy



File: 11291

Sunnyvale West Channel

RECEIVED

JUL 13 2015

PLANNING DIVISION

July 9, 2015

Ms. Amber El-Hajj
City of Sunnyvale
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088

Subject: Notice of Preparation for the Peery Park Specific Plan

Dear Ms. El-Hajj:

The Santa Clara Valley Water District is a special district with jurisdiction throughout Santa Clara County. The Water District acts as the county's groundwater management agency, principal water resources manager, flood protection agency and is the steward for its watersheds, streams and creeks, and underground aquifers. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIR for the City's Peery Park Specific Plan. This letter transmits comments that focus on the areas of interest and expertise of the Water District.

Flooding

The Specific Plan Area contains Sunnyvale West Channel. The Water District is planning improvements to the channel to protect the area from the 100-year flood event. Although areas within the specific plan area may be exempt from complying with the hydro-modification requirements of the NPDES permit, this exemption is based on the limited potential for increased flows to cause downstream erosion. The EIR will need to address potential flood impacts associated with increased impervious surface. With the Sunnyvale East and West Channels Flood Protection Project, specific plan areas will be protected (up to the 1% riverine flood event). However, flooding may still occur if a natural event exceeds the 1% design level or from tidal flooding including anticipated sea level rise. Understanding the residual risks inherent to homes and businesses protected by flood control facilities is an important aspect to evaluating and managing flood risk. This is a matter of public safety as well as economic protection. Critical facilities and access routes thereto, should be evaluated for their proximity to flood-prone areas.

Stewardship

The Water District works to protect our watersheds by promoting good ecosystem habitat, stream biology and water quality. Significant factors affecting watershed health include the extent of development within a riparian corridor, and the extent of pollutants, sediments, and trash. The EIR needs to address the impacts that this new development may have on storm water in regard to the stability of the receiving storm channels and the quality of the water.

Setbacks from storm channel corridors are necessary to provide adequate space to maintain the channels and levees, protect the ecology of the corridors, and if necessary, improve flood protection projects. The EIR should evaluate the Plan's impact to the biological resources of the storm channels, the use as a migratory corridor by wildlife, and the impact development may have on access to channels for flood prevention efforts.

Ms. Amber El-Hajj
Page 2
July 9, 2015

Water Supply

The Water District is dedicated to ensuring a reliable supply of healthy, clean drinking water now and in the future. To do this, the quality and quantity of existing water supply sources, including groundwater, must be sustained and protected. Since the Water District conjunctively manages the groundwater basin, the groundwater section should look at the total change in demand as future changes in use have the potential to affect all sources of supply.

The size of the Specific Plan suggests that a Water Supply Assessment would be required. The City of Sunnyvale currently uses relatively little groundwater and is proposing to expand recycled water use. However, the EIR analysis needs to ensure that future demands are sustainable should the City change its water supply mix in the future; therefore a determination if the use of potable water may increase as a result of this development is needed. Water conservation and recycled water use are increasingly important components of the County's water supply portfolio. Given the cumulative water demand to meet the needs of projected growth throughout northern Santa Clara County, as documented by ABAG and in each of the local jurisdictions' General Plans, measures should be incorporated to minimize water use. These could include provisions for recycled water, enhanced requirements for water saving devices within new structures, and enhanced limitations to landscaping.

If you have any questions or need further information, you can reach me at (408) 630-3095.

Sincerely,



for

Michael Martin
Environmental Planner
Santa Clara Valley Water District

cc: S. Tippetts, L. Lee, U. Chatwani, S. Ferranti, G. De La Piedra, File

11291_57739mm07-09

County of Santa Clara

Roads and Airports Department

101 Skyport Drive
San Jose, California 95110-1302
1-408-573-2400



July 6, 2015

Amber El-Hajj
City of Sunnyvale
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

**SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report
Peery Park Specific Plan Project**

Dear Ms. El-Hajj:

The County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department is submitting the following comments regarding the preparation of an environmental impact report for the project cited above.

A Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) should be prepared for the proposed project following the latest adopted Congestion Management Program (CMP) TIA Guidelines to identify significant impacts for the DEIR. County requests, at a minimum, to include the following intersections for analysis.

- Central Expressway at Mathilda square loops, Mary Avenue, SR-237/Ferguson Drive, N Whisman Station Drive, SR-85 ramps, Castro Street/Moffett Boulevard, Shoreline Boulevard (east), Shoreline Boulevard (west), and Rengstorff Avenue.
- Lawrence Expressway at Reed Avenue/Monroe Street, Kifer Road, and Central Expressway ramps, Arques Avenue, Duane Avenue/Oakmead Parkway, US-101 ramps and Tasman Drive.
- San Tomas Expressway at Walsh Avenue, Central Expressway ramps and Scott Boulevard.

The analysis should be conducted using most recent counts and County signal timing for County study intersections. Please contact Ananth Prasad at (408) 494-1342 or Ananth.Prasad@rda.sccgov.org for the correct signal timing.

The vicinity map (Figure 1) attached with the NOP-DEIR and any other figures to be included in the study should reflect the accurate roadway network (for example, Mary Avenue should continue through Central Expressway).

The preliminary *Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study – 2040* project list should be consulted for a list of mitigation measures for significant impacts to the expressways. Should the preliminary *Expressway Plan 2040* project list not include an improvement that would mitigate a significant impact, the TIA should identify mitigation measures that would address the significant impact. Mitigation measures listed in the TIA should be incorporated into the EIR document.

Peery Park Specific Plan Project
July 6, 2015
Page 2 of 2

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of the DEIR. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact me at 408-572-2465 or at dawn.cameron@rda.sccgov.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dawn Cameron", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Dawn S. Cameron
County Transportation Planner

cc: MA



July 9, 2015

City of Sunnyvale
Planning Division
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

Attention: Amber El-Haij

Subject: City File No.: 2013-7653 / Peery Park Specific Plan

Dear Ms..El-Haij:

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff have reviewed the NOP for a specific plan to increase the amount of development by 2.2 million square feet for the area bounded by SR 237, Mathilda Avenue, and Southern Pacific Lines. We have the following comments.

Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Report

VTA's Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more net new peak-hour trips. Based on the information provided on the size of this project, a TIA may be required. The updated 2014 VTA *TIA Guidelines*, which can be found at <http://www.vta.org/cmp/tia-guidelines>, include updated procedures for documenting auto trip reductions, analyzing non-auto modes, and evaluating mitigation measures and improvements to address project impacts and effects on the transportation system. For any questions about the updated *TIA Guidelines*, please contact Robert Swierk of the VTA Planning and Program Development Division at 408-321-5949 or Robert.Swierk@vta.org.

Transportation Analysis

VTA recommends that the City take a multimodal approach to transportation analysis in the DEIR and TIA. VTA recommends using performance indicators such as vehicle miles travelled (VMT), non-auto mode shares, transit boardings, and air quality emissions, in addition to automobile Level of Service (LOS). The analysis should also address pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in addition to roadways.

CMP Facilities

Based on the size and location of future development considered in the Peery Park Specific Plan, there may be impacts to one or more CMP facilities, including freeway segments and CMP intersections. If the transportation analysis indicates that there will be significant impacts according to CMP criteria, VTA suggests early coordination with the appropriate agencies to

City of Sunnyvale
July 9, 2015
Page 2

identify potential mitigation measures and voluntary contribution opportunities based on the latest Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) projects in the project area.

Transit Service


The Transportation analysis in the DEIR and TIA should discuss how local transit connections to, from and within the Peery Park Specific Plan area will be provided. By intensifying land uses in an area just beyond walking distance from the Sunnyvale Caltrain Station and VTA light rail service, the Peery Park Specific Plan will create the need for additional “first and last mile” connections between transit and intensified development. VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy & Service Design Guidelines (TSP/SDG), adopted by the VTA Board in February 2007, contains thresholds and guidelines for considering potential VTA transit service changes, and VTA has recently worked with the City to identify improvement options through the North Central County Bus Improvement Plan. VTA encourages the City to work with the land owners and employers in this area to identify other options such as shuttles or public-private partnerships, including funding sources, to increase mobility options in the area.

Transportation Demand Management/Trip Reduction

VTA commends the City for proposing a framework of graduated trip reductions (20% to 35%) based on project size, including a robust monitoring and enforcement program, as outlined in the “Draft Vision, Guiding Principles, Goals, Policies and Key Implementation Concepts” attachment for the April 28, 2015 City Council meeting. VTA recommends that the assumptions regarding auto trip reductions be clearly explained and documented in the DEIR and TIA, and notes that the trip reduction approach outlined in the April 28th Council packet is consistent with the Target-Based Trip Reduction Approach in the October 2014 VTA TIA Guidelines. VTA would like to continue to partner with the City of Sunnyvale to support the trip reduction goals of the Peery Park Specific Plan, the establishment of a Transportation Management Association (TMA), and the improvement of mobility options in the area.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions, please call me at (408) 321-5784.

Sincerely,



Roy Molseed
Senior Environmental Planner

cc: Brian Brander, Caltrans
Patricia Maurice, Caltrans

SU1508

Amber El-Hajj
Sunnyvale Planning Department, City of Sunnyvale

Dear Amber and Sunnyvale Staff,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the Peery Park Specific Plan EIR.

Friends of Caltrain is a nonprofit organization with over 4000 participants on the Peninsula corridor from San Francisco through San Jose including hundreds in Sunnyvale. We focus on transit funding and modernization, and policies supporting sustainable transportation on the Peninsula corridor.

Following are comments regarding options to study in the EIR.

The Transportation Demand Management requirements are positive, including the staff recommendation to evaluate and adjust the TDM goal during plan implementation to determine the feasibility of increasing the goals over time. A higher goal should be studied as an option to show the relative transportation impact of a higher goal, should it be achievable. A best practice for TDM/TMA success is to require public reporting (this is required in the City of San Mateo Rail Corridor Plan, for example). Reporting requirements are very beneficial for accountability and community confidence, and we strongly encourage this policy.

It is our understanding that Sunnyvale is starting to include assessments of vehicle miles traveled per capita in new Environmental Impact Reports, in line with the direction of the new state law, SB743. Although the implementation rules for the new law have not yet been finalized, the highly likely direction is to use Vehicle Miles per Capita as the primary metric to assess environmental impacts. Starting to use VMT/capita as a metric now will provide greater longevity to the plan, and will more strongly show the environmental benefits and impacts of plan alternatives.

There is new information suggesting stronger assumptions regarding bicycle transportation. In a recent plan published by Google regarding commuting to their Mountain View campus, Google reported that 20% of people who commute to the Mountain View campus from a distance of five miles or less use a bicycle to commute today. Google's goal is to achieve a 40% bicycle commute rate for people who live within 5 miles of the Mountain View HQ.

<http://www.citylab.com/commute/2015/06/googles-new-bike-plan-wants-silicon-valley-to-be-more-like-copenhagen/395885/>

Peery Park is within convenient bicycle commuting distance from areas where Sunnyvale is adding thousands of units of housing overall, including the Sunnyvale Downtown Plan area (just 1 mile away), the Lawrence Station Area (less than 5 miles), and most of the El Camino Real Precise Plan area, from Mary to Remington is less than 3 miles from Peery Park by bicycle.

The City is currently planning an update to the Bicycle Master Plan, which is on a later timeline than the Peery Park Specific Plan. In the meantime, Sunnyvale experiences a bicycle commute percentage less than 1% today. Given the success rate at a nearby employment center and upcoming planning, the

Specific Plan should include scenario or alternative assuming a 20% bicycle commute rate within a 5 mile radius, taking into account anticipated land use changes over the life of the plan. Impact fees and community benefits from the Peery Park Plan should be used to contribute to bicycle route improvements within the convenient 3-5 mile bicycle commute radius to foster the growth in bicycle use as a substantial commute mode.

Local shuttles can also be an attractive commute mode for short trips. Given the proximity to the Lawrence Station Area and the anticipated housing growth in that area, the TDM plans for the area should consider shuttle routes connecting the Lawrence Station Area with the Peery Park area, in partnership with the developments and transportation management programs for the Lawrence Station Area in Sunnyvale and Santa Clara.

Lastly, the plan currently contemplates adding 2.2 million square feet of office space with minimal housing (215 units). Additional housing in the plan area has the potential to vehicle trips and greenhouse gas emissions, and should be studied as an alternative.

Beyond the potential transportation benefits, additional housing would help address the city's growing jobs housing imbalance, which contributes to traffic issues from long-distance commuting, and contributes to the housing affordability crisis which severely impacts even professional workers, not to mention low-to-moderate income workers, younger and older residents.

The Plan should also investigate the assumptions behind the correlation between office space and number of workers. The draft plan assumes 425 square feet per employee, which our recent research shows a more typical ratio of 225 to 250 square feet per worker, which would indicate a much steeper contribution of the Peery Park Specific Plan to the city's jobs housing imbalance.

While it is not possible or desirable for Sunnyvale, or any one city, to address the region's jobs housing imbalance, housing affordability crisis, and associated commute congestion, other cities in the region are also working on addressing the issue. The City of Mountain View has already approved housing in the North Bayshore area where Google is, and is considering more. The City of Menlo Park is conducting an EIR considering adding 4500 units of housing in the area near Facebook.

In both of these examples, cities are looking to convert areas that were initially designed as single use office parks into "live work play" areas, which do a better job of meeting the market preferences for today's workforce, and help address housing affordability and commute congestion and pollution issues. Therefore we urge Sunnyvale to include an option in the Peery Park plan with substantial housing.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Adina

Adina Levin
Friends of Caltrain
<http://greencaltrain.com>
650-646-4344

July 7, 2015

Dear Amber El-hajj,

We are writing to you to express our strong support for more housing, especially more affordable housing in the Peery Park Specific Plan.

Our understanding is that four to ten thousand new jobs may be created (1 job=478 sq.ft.or 1 job= 225 sq.ft.). But even with four thousand new jobs, there seems to be no real effort to plan for housing needs. Since we already have too many jobs for the amount of housing, this forces Sunnyvale's home and rental prices to continue to rise, which prices most workers and families out of the market. We feel that it is critical to address our growing jobs to housing imbalance now.

We all know that there are multiple important benefits for workers and their families to live where they work: Walking, biking, and shuttles all become more usable and viable options. Sunnyvale's economy benefits from increased revenues as workers eat, shop and recreate at home; overall, less driving and fewer cars driving through Sunnyvale, create a healthier, happier population and environment.

During this review period, we hope you will plan for more housing and more affordable housing that most of our residents (56% from a June poll) want and desperately need.

Thank you for your consideration,

The Affordable Housing Committee
Democratic Club of Sunnyvale



Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Peery Park Specific Plan Comment

Lidia Marchioni <lidiyam@gmail.com>

Fri, Jul 10, 2015 at 1:21 AM

To: ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Hello Amber

I'm a resident of Sunnyvale and I have recently learned about the Peery Park Specific Plan. I wanted to make a few comments, but have just now realized that the deadline was earlier today. In case my comments can be still accepted, here they are:

1. The area of the new development is very close to the city's center. Such areas should be human friendly: pedestrian friendly and inviting for people at different times of the day. It is important to green the space with plants and trees and include cafes, restaurants and retail stores. Otherwise they become corporate deserts in the middle of the city: visited only during business hours and ghost towns otherwise.
2. Due to proximity to the town center only underground parking should be considered for larger buildings so that there is more pedestrian area. There should be minimum space lost to parking. Space that is lost – should be designated in near by areas as additional park/pedestrian areas.
3. Considering global warming and commonly wasted space – roof – all newly erected buildings should either allow for food production, solar power generation or other green use of rooftops. This could be a living roof with drought tolerant plants, raised beds for organic urban farming, food production with aquaponics system, or a rooftop green cafe.
4. Sections of buildings should have living walls installed - walls covered with living plants. The plants take up carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, create an insulating layer for the wall and are pleasing esthetically, relaxing and thus inviting.
5. Considering current drought and unpredictable future weather patterns, there should be no rain water runoff from the site. All plantings should be done in sunken gardens, rather than on raised mounds, that require even more water to keep them hydrated. Sunken, mulched basins should be created, such as by the Cupertino Library. Another example of no runoff implementation is Village Homes in Davis.
6. It would be great to see planting of edibles: e.g. fruit trees in the pedestrian only areas. Perhaps harvest of fruit could be arranged with local non profits and food banks.

I hope that the new development will allow Sunnyvale residents to feel welcome and will create a vibrant center for businesses and residents alike.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kind regards
Lidia Marchioni

Sunnyvale City Councilmembers,

I am utterly amazed!

The 'Peery Park Specific Plan Initial Study' document defies previously identified damages resultant from resident's outcries and the movement of a planned LinkedIn corporate headquarters out of our city! The Environmental Checklist Form, pages 19-21 is deeply flawed.

The project calls for three more buildings of 70 feet in height along Mathilda next to the existing controversial LinkedIn buildings. Clearly, city staff has not abided by the public outcry which is still reverberating from the neighborhood impacted by the too-tall LinkedIn buildings on Mathilda.

Under Aesthetics:

- a) "Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vista? – No Impact"
- b) "Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area? – Less than significant impact"
- c) "Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? – No significant impact"

Clearly, the neighborhood across Mathilda Avenue has reported a problem with glare off the new LinkedIn buildings and lights from the buildings that bother them at night. The city's response to this livability issue is to say the following. "Street lighting is the predominant source of nighttime light and glare". Additionally, the city's report defines impact only to the areas within the Peery Park boundaries, ignoring the impact to the neighborhood across the "boundary" (across Mathilda Avenue).

I am flabbergasted to discover that the city plans on putting in no landscaping buffer for Pine Avenue. After all the complaints, news articles and public testimony that led the city to add a landscaping tree buffer from the existing LinkedIn buildings – none is required for three new additional buildings. Instead the reports states "Removal of trees and their replacement with structures could also intensity the effects of night lighting. Changes in glare would be contained within the existing employment area."

Please do not approve this proposal until all the effects on all the stakeholders have been thoroughly studied. Several councilmembers regretted their decision to approve the original LinkedIn buildings, so let's not make the same mistake.

Finally, **I am not in favor of this mass undertaking in Perry Park.** The plan calls for 1.5 million more square feet of office and will trigger more residential development. The entire proposal would entail infrastructure improvement costs in roads, public services and schools that the corporations and real estate developers will not have to pay for thus leaving the residents to be forced to pay these costs. **This is a very bad deal for Sunnyvale residents!**

Holly Lofgren

Sunnyvale Resident



Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Peery Park - Traffic on Mathilda

Peter Renner <peter.e.renner@gmail.com>

Fri, Jul 3, 2015 at 5:38 PM

To: ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Hello Amber El-Hajj,

I received a letter about the Peery Park Community Workshop. While I will not be able to attend, I wanted to point out the significant traffic on Mathilda traveling:

- North in the mornings on weekdays, particularly between 101 and 237.
- South in the evenings on weekdays through the Peery Park District.

I believe the traffic going north in the mornings between 101 and 237 especially can be improved by simply changing the timing of the lights. I also believe the traffic going south in the evenings could also be improved in this way.

If you have more information concerning the traffic in this area, please feel free to let me know.

Peter Renner



Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

EIR Peery Park

SRPEQN <srpeqn@gmail.com>

Thu, Jul 9, 2015 at 1:53 PM

To: Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Cc: City Council <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Hi Amber,

Please see the links below. The building have had a profound impact on our neighborhood and we do not see any plans to mitigate it. In addition the draft of the EIR indicates there has been no visual impact or additional glare or night time light. We have all. I've enclosed one of many examples of the night time lights. The glare is worse in the winter months when the sun is low in the sky.

We wanted to share the links and pictures in addition to our comments at the June 25th meeting.

<http://www.nbcbayarea.com/video/#!/on-air/as-seen-on/New-Office-Buildings-Spark-Concerns-in-Sunnyvale/302096441>

<http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2015/05/04/sunnyvale-neighborhood-upset-six-story-buildings-next-door-linked-in-apple/>

Ann has a file to share with you on OneDrive. To view it, click the link below.



Thank you,
Dwight and Ann Davis



Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Peery Park Specific Plan Comments

Mike Serrone <mikeserrone@comcast.net>
To: ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Wed, Jul 8, 2015 at 11:44 PM

Amber El-Hajj,

I am a 30-year resident of Sunnyvale and have worked in Sunnyvale, specifically in the Peery Park area, most of my career. I am currently employed in Sunnyvale City Center.

Peery Park offers many opportunities for development, however the current plan seems to be dominated by high density office/R&D/Industrial space with only 215 residential units. Sunnyvale already has a severe jobs/housing imbalance and this plan would only make it worse.

Peery Park could be the focus of an "urban village" development with housing, retail and office/R&D/industrial space. There should also be an extensive network of protected pedestrian/bike lanes providing access to other parts of the city.

The "Linkedin" development at Maude and Mathilda has become the poster child for poorly managed developments. The entire site, by its design, reflects indifference or even contempt for the surrounding neighborhood and has driven the growth of a strong anti-development movement in Sunnyvale. This will only make it harder to make the right choices for Peery Park.

Peery Park can become a positive example of good urban planning if the Specific Plan focuses on enhancing Sunnyvale as a whole as opposed to supporting the addition of several disjointed office parks providing no benefits to the surrounding communities.

Best Regards,

Mike Serrone
665 Winggate Drive
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
408-431-0511

Sunnyvale City Councilmembers,

I am utterly amazed!

The 'Peery Park Specific Plan Initial Study' document defies previously identified damages resultant from resident's outcries and the movement of a planned LinkedIn corporate headquarters out of our city! The Environmental Checklist Form, pages 19-21 is deeply flawed.

The project calls for three more buildings of 70 feet in height along Mathilda next to the existing controversial LinkedIn buildings. Clearly, city staff has not abided by the public outcry which is still reverberating from the neighborhood impacted by the too-tall LinkedIn buildings on Mathilda.

Under Aesthetics:

- a) "Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vista? – No Impact"
- b) "Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area? – Less than significant impact"
- c) "Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? – No significant impact"

Clearly, the neighborhood across Mathilda Avenue has reported a problem with glare off the new LinkedIn buildings and lights from the buildings that bother them at night. The city's response to this livability issue is to say the following. "Street lighting is the predominant source of nighttime light and glare". Additionally, the city's report defines impact only to the areas within the Peery Park boundaries, ignoring the impact to the neighborhood across the "boundary" (across Mathilda Avenue).

I am flabbergasted to discover that the city plans on putting in no landscaping buffer for Pine Avenue. After all the complaints, news articles and public testimony that led the city to add a landscaping tree buffer from the existing LinkedIn buildings – none is required for three new additional buildings. Instead the reports states "Removal of trees and their replacement with structures could also intensify the effects of night lighting. Changes in glare would be contained within the existing employment area."

Please do not approve this proposal until all the effects on all the stakeholders have been thoroughly studied. Several councilmembers regretted their decision to approve the original LinkedIn buildings, so let's not make the same mistake.

Finally, **I am not in favor of this mass undertaking in Perry Park.** The plan calls for 1.5 million more square feet of office and will trigger more residential development. The entire proposal would entail infrastructure improvement costs in roads, public services and schools that the corporations and real estate developers will not have to pay for thus leaving the residents to be forced to pay these costs. **This is a very bad deal for Sunnyvale residents!**

Holly Lofgren

Sunnyvale Resident



Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Response to Peery Park Report

Glenda Ortez-Galan <galans@me.com>

Thu, Jul 9, 2015 at 3:33 PM

To: AEL-HAJJ@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Dear Amber El-Hajj,


I took some time to review the majority of the Peery Park Report and was very surprised to see that on page 19 of the report, it indicates there will be "no" or "less than significant impact on aesthetics." More specifically, the box is checked off as "less than significant impact" on point c.) "substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings." I live on Beechnut Avenue and Pine and can assure you that the buildings that will be leased to Apple (LinkedIn) have substantially degraded the visual character AND quality of my neighborhood. Attached please find a picture of how the 6-story buildings are seen from my living room window. By continuing to build tall structures around our neighborhood, the City will certainly continue to degraded our neighborhood to the point where no one will have a view of the sky.

I would also like to add that my TV reception has been significantly altered, and I was forced to subscribe to cable TV.

The damage is done on my side of the neighborhood. Please do not make the same mistakes the city committed by continuing to cause more damage to the residents of Sunnyvale.

Thank you,
Glenda Ortez-Galan

Glenda Ortez-Galan





Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Feedback on PPSP "Initial Study & Environmental Checklist"

David King <ginku_ledovec@att.net>

Tue, Jul 7, 2015 at 11:25 PM

To: Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Hello Amber,

Below you'll find my feedback for the Peery Park Specific Plan "Initial Study & Environmental Checklist". Sorry to be so late in the week in getting this to you. Let me know if any of the items don't make sense. Sometimes my typing is better in my head, than on the page.

- Dave King

=====

Feedback on PPSP Initial Study Environmental Checklist - dated June 9, 2015 - by Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure Inc.

Dave King
680 Manzanita Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
ginku_ledovec@att.net

#1a - Unless I missed it, the work cited for traffic flows and bottlenecks fails to include the intersection of Maude & Mathilda when gathering data for traffic flows, Level of Service (LOS), etc. For example, see Table 7, page 61 - and any discussion in document that references that Table 7.

#1b - The data cited in Table 7, "2010 Project Area Intersection Level of Service (LOS)" is now approx. 5 years old. Current baseline numbers/measurements (especially for the Maude & Mathilda intersection) need to be established BEFORE the two new large buildings near intersection of Maude & Mathilda are occupied, and before further Peery Park development near this intersection.

#1c - More attention needs to be paid to the Maude & Mathilda intersection for a variety of reasons, which include: traffic in and out of the shopping center at that intersection, use of Maude Avenue to access Peery Park area from direction of Fair Oaks Avenue, and use of Maude Avenue by residential areas adjacent to Maude & Mathilda intersection - and those residential areas along Maude Avenue between Mathilda and North Fair Oaks Avenue.

#1d - This document (Peery Park Specific Plan "Initial Study Environmental Checklist") indicates the following on page 6: "VTA is scheduled to implement route changes in July 2015 using Maude Avenue instead of Central Expressway" for VTA bus routes 32 & 54. The effect of this on traffic along Maude (if any) needs to be measured as well and as soon as possible, before any further development in Peery Park - to establish base line data.

#1e - Since Maude Avenue may become an access route to Peery Park area, due to heavier traffic on Mathilda corridor - partially caused by Peery Park development and development to north of U.S. 101 & 237, how will Maude, east of Mathilda, be able to accommodate vehicle traffic including buses, and expanded bike lanes (I expect them to be lobbied for heavily). Street parking along Maude is currently used by those who live in area and for businesses along Maude. Quite a lot to fit on a 2-lane city road, on section between Mathilda and Fair Oaks Avenue. For those who use Maude Avenue for businesses and residential parking: what new uses of Maude might they gain? What current uses of Maude would they lose?

#2 - The PPSP "Initial Study and Environmental Checklist" may not mention it, but I'll bring this up anyway. There has been talk at Council meetings or in some of the Peery Park workshops about businesses sited in Peery Park working with the City in some arrangement (managed by the businesses) to offer shuttles for people

to help reduce vehicle load on Mathilda and feeder streets. This shuttle arrangement would be on a handshake or "gentlemen's agreement", that would not be binding on the businesses if implemented. While current business management and ownership may have the best of intentions - their intentions could change (along with management & ownership). And the voluntary arrangement would then quickly fall apart. If the city does not have any leverage on this kind of arrangement, it is almost bound to fall apart at some point. Particularly if some businesses pull out, and the remaining businesses are asked to foot the bill and carry the passenger load for everyone.

Personal letter to Ael-haij@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Dear Amber Ael-haije,

I am a homeowner and have been a resident of Sunnyvale for 30 plus years. My specific concern regarding the Peery Park Project is that it should provide affordable housing to low -wage workers. I also would like to see walkable, bike- rideable and shuttle routes to other planned developments: I strongly encourage protected bike lanes which can often be done with potted plants, cones, etc.

I believe this is a perfect opportunity to engage a view of the whole of Sunnyvale itself as an “ urban village “ or campus where access and connectivity is key. Sunnyvale Village is a place to live and work and raise families, not a home to employers where workers must drive from other cities. Sunnyvale’s economy would benefit with more people staying here to eat, shop, pick up children, and recreate. I believe this benefits my fellow residents as well.

One additional comment is that I hope aesthetics, green space and vegetation will be well-considered and vital to our developments.

Sincerely,
Sue Serrone
665 Winggate Dr.
Sunnyvale
408 773 8851



**Peery Park Specific Plan
Environmental Impact Report
Scoping Meeting
June 25, 2015**

Name: Bonnie Lloyd
Address: 802 Borregas Ave., Sunnyvale
Phone no: 408 747-1949 94085
E-mail: -0-

7-6-15

Please send your written/typed comments by 5:00 p.m. July 9, 2015 to the following (include a name and contact information):

Amber El-Hajj, Senior Planner
456 W. Olive Avenue
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707
Or via email: ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Please comment on what environmental resources or issues should be studied within the Environmental Impact Report:

Suggested public park, residential
zone with parking garage.

New post office.



Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Peery Park Specific Plan

don v <thedenzels@gmail.com>

Thu, Jun 25, 2015 at 7:41 AM

To: Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

To whom it may concern:

Based on the city's calculation of one job for every 478 square feet of commercial space, Peery Park will eventually create 4600 new jobs. Based on what some people feel is a more realistic calculation (one job for every 225 square feet of commercial space), Peery Park will create 9777 new jobs. Whichever figure is believed, the number of new jobs will be vastly greater than the total number of housing units planned for Peery Park: only 215.

An imbalance between jobs and housing leads to all kinds of problems: the competition for apartments raises rents, existing housing becomes overcrowded, people are forced to commute for longer distances, creating more traffic and air-pollution. At worst, families with working parents become homeless because even multiple jobs can't meet market rates of rent.

The Peery Park initial plan recognizes that PP will "increase the imbalance between jobs and housing within the City." But, the plan says, "increases in the City supply [of housing] as well as workforce housing...within the greater Bay Area is anticipated to be able to accommodate most new positions." Nevertheless, "the supply and demand for housing would be addressed in the E[nvironmental] I[m]pact) R[e]port."

I hope that the EIR eventually recommends increasing the ratio of houses to jobs in Peery Park. Similar development projects in Mountain View and Menlo Park which began with zero provision for housing have evolved so that now the North Bayshore project is planned to include 1100 residential units and the Facebook Campus Expansion to include 4500 residential units: 1100 and 4500 compared to 215 in Peery Park! I don't know what the right number of residential units for Peery Park should be, except that it needs to be a lot higher. Sunnyvale ought not to expect its neighbors to provide the housing for workers who will contribute most directly to Sunnyvale's economy.

Sincerely,

Don Veith

955 Iris Avenue

408-736-9006



Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Project #2013-7653

Alkire, Martin <Martin.Alkire@mountainview.gov>

Wed, Jun 24, 2015 at 2:59 PM

To: "Amber El-Hajj (ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov)" <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Cc: "Fakhry, Sayed" <Sayed.Fakhry@mountainview.gov>, "Arango, Ed" <Ed.Arango@mountainview.gov>

Hi Amber,

Regarding the NOP for the Peery Park Specific Plan project, the City would like to see the following topics addressed in the EIR analysis:

- Study intersections

Ellis/Clyde

Ellis/Middlefield

Middlefield/Ferguson

Middlefield/ Bernardo

ECR/Sylvan

ECR/Grant/Hwy 237 (CMP)

- Maps and diagrams showing how any proposed multi-modal improvements tie into existing or proposed improvements of neighboring cities

-

- Employee per SF assumptions for different land uses, with a particular emphasis on office uses

-

- A discussion of the project's jobs/housing ratio compared to the City, region, and neighboring cities

-

- A discussion of TDM requirements for new development, if any, and if part of any mitigation measure

-

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Best

Martin



**Peery Park Specific Plan
Environmental Impact Report
Scoping Meeting
June 25, 2015**

Name: Donald Kirker
Address: 450 N Mathilda Ave Apt 0106
Phone no: 707-694-2483
E-mail: dkirker@gmail.com dkirker@gmail.com

Please send your written/typed comments by 5:00 p.m. July 9, 2015 to the following (include a name and contact information):

Amber El-Hajj, Senior Planner
456 W. Olive Avenue
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707
Or via email: a-el-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Please comment on what environmental resources or issues should be studied within the Environmental Impact Report:

- 221 N Mathilda contains property with significant environmental and historical value. The craftsman style farmhouse is a monument to the city's heritage, as do the trees and shrubbery. Preservations should be required.
- Control and operation of the lights along Mathilda provide for a lot of vehicular idling while exiting Central Expy on to Mathilda, and carrying traffic along Mathilda to 101 and El Camino/280.
- Echo sentiments about lack of generation of housing. Rent is becoming too expensive.

Overall impact on the city. There is a lot of under-utilized office space amongst other parts of the city. Would adding more be necessary? North of 101 over by Crossman and along Java Dr seem to contain many offices available for lease, over the last three years that I have lived here.

- A request at the EIR meeting on June 25 requested a park, since only a small one exists off Main named Encinal. How about 221 N Mathilda? ☺



July 8, 2015

Ms. Amber El-Hajj
Senior Planner, Community Development Department
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
(408) 730-2723

Via email (ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

Re: Comments on Notice of Preparation and Initial Study, Project # 2013-7653, Peery Park Specific Plan

Dear Ms. El-Hajj,

As the owner of a substantial portion of property and developer of a proposed net new 714,000 square foot master planned office project within the Peery Park Specific Plan area, The Irvine Company (TIC) supports City of Sunnyvale (City) efforts around the Peery Park Specific Plan and associated review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). TIC appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) for the Peery Park Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). TIC is supportive of the City's vision to redevelop under-utilized and under-developed industrial properties in the Peery Park Specific Plan area, in order to facilitate development of new Class A commercial space for technology-based business development and creation of key activity centers with mixed commercial and residential uses.

TIC has reviewed the NOP and IS, and submits the following comments for the City's consideration in preparation of the EIR:

1. ***NOP Project Description; IS Project Description.*** The NOP and IS Project Descriptions state that the Project area has approximately 7 million square feet (sf) of existing development with another 0.5 million sf approved or under construction. The Project studied includes an increase of 2.2 million sf over the existing and approved for a total of 9.7 million sf of development capacity within Peery Park.

Comment: Please specify in the EIR Project Description the assumptions regarding existing square footage and development approved or under construction; for example, include a list of properties by address and APN, identifying for each the existing square footage and/or development approved or under construction that is assumed as part of the existing development within the Peery Park Specific Plan area. Technical reports including traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas, noise, and others based on development intensity, should similarly specify assumptions about existing and approved/under construction development assumed as part of "baseline"/existing conditions.

Please also clarify in the EIR Project Description any assumptions that will be made regarding additional density/intensity that could be allowed through green building incentives, and how these green building incentives are accounted for in the EIR's impact analysis.

2. ***NOP Project Description.*** The NOP Project description states that the Project “would include improvements to transit accessibility and interconnectivity to support the non-vehicle commutes, including potential expansion of shuttle services within Peery Park to connect employees with regional rail transit provided by VTA and Caltrain.”

Comment: TIC supports the City's efforts to promote non-vehicle transportation use. We suggest that the EIR should evaluate a menu of options, including but not limited to potential expansion of shuttle services, bicycle/pedestrian improvements, and other similar measures, to ensure that a range of effective and feasible options can be implemented as part of the Project, as appropriate.

3. ***IS Project Background:*** The IS states that more development beyond the projected Project development capacity is theoretically possible under the Project's proposed land use and development regulations. However, the intent of the Project is to project a development scenario within a reasonable time horizon for specific plans (10-20 years). This approach allows the EIR to identify impacts due to development, identify realistic mitigations for those impacts, and if necessary, set reasonable caps on development capacity based on the magnitude of the impacts and the timing of mitigations. The EIR would also incorporate Plan implementation over time and adjusting the development cap or mitigation measures as necessary in response to actual impacts.

Comment: TIC suggests that the EIR should analyze the full build-out scenario under the Specific Plan's proposed land use and development regulations, rather than a lower development density based on a generalized development cap. However, if the City determines to analyze a limited development scenario that is less than full build-out of the Specific Plan, we request that the EIR clearly identify the assumptions regarding the development scenario analyzed, including parcel-by-parcel assumptions regarding use and square footage/intensity/density.

Further, TIC suggests that in lieu of establishing a development cap, the EIR can state that any projects that would have environmental impacts that are more severe or different from those identified in the Specific Plan EIR would be required to undergo project-specific review, to the extent required by CEQA, to allow identification of appropriate mitigation measures.

Finally, TIC is supportive of mitigation measures that are designed to respond to impacts over time by including a “trigger,” at which point the mitigation is required. For example, a certain mitigation measure would be required when a certain amount of development is approved and under construction within the Specific Plan area or a certain impact occurs due to the level of development.

4. ***Aesthetics:*** The IS notes that under SB 743, a project's aesthetics impacts are not considered significant impacts on the environment if: (1) the project is a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project; and (2) the project is located on an infill site within a transit priority area. The IS states that the Project is located on an infill site within a transit priority area served by the Middlefield and Moffett Park Stations of the VTA light rail, the Sunnyvale Station of Caltrain, and local VTA bus routes.

Comment: Under SB 743, a "transit priority area" is defined as an area within one-half mile of a major transit stop that is existing or planned. Pub. Res. Code § 21099(a)(7). TIC suggests that the EIR should clarify which transit stops are used to determine the "transit priority area," and the extent to which the entire Specific Plan area, or only a portion thereof, qualifies as a "transit priority area" under this definition.

5. ***Air Quality:*** The IS states that the Project would include a variety of measures to reduce future emissions associated with redevelopment of the Project area. These would include Traffic Demand Management (TDM), accessibility to regional public transit infrastructure, building efficiency requirements, and other measures to address consistency with the 2010 CAP.

Comment: TIC is supportive of the City's efforts to reduce emissions that impact air quality. We request that the EIR specify the measures that would be assumed as part of the analysis, and consider including a menu of options that would allow projects to select measures most appropriate for a specific site/project, including the potential for folding TDMs into the program for a Transportation Management Agency (TMA) at Peery Park.

6. ***Hazards:*** The IS states that the proposed Project contains several contaminated sites associated with historic and ongoing industrial activities and that prior to development, including both demolition of existing structures and new construction involving hazardous materials, the City would review and issue a consolidated permit for all hazardous materials usages regulated by the California DTSC and the USEPA.

Comment: Please clarify the intended use and coverage of "consolidated permit" for hazardous materials usages at the site. TIC suggest that consistent with the City's Municipal Code Section 20.10.050, individual sites within the Project area obtain and keep current a hazardous materials permit.

Further, please clarify the scope of the City's regulatory oversight role in future and ongoing remedial response actions at individual parcels within the Project area. For example, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) is the lead agency for remediation at the Siemens site located at 639 N. Pastoria Ave (within the Project area). TIC suggests the EIR clarify that the Water Board or the California DTSC may be the appropriate regulatory agencies to oversee future or ongoing remedial actions at other individual sites within the Project area.

7. ***Moffett Federal Airfield Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP):*** The IS notes that the Project area is located within the Moffett Federal Airfield Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) Airport Influence Area, and the Moffett Federal Airfield safety zone, which is

subject to development restrictions to minimize potential land use conflicts and hazards. The IS variously describes that the project is reviewed for consistency with the CLUP, and that the project must comply with the CLUP.

Comment: Please clarify whether the EIR's technical analyses that take into account the number of persons per square foot (e.g., occupancy for calculating travel demand, water demand) will assume a population density that is consistent with the safety zone recommended density or another metric, such as a standard amount of square footage per employee or occupant.

Further, TIC notes that the Specific Plan is referred to the Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission for review of consistency with the CLUP, as required by Cal. Pub. Util. Code Sec. 21676(b). However, the IS states in several places that the Project must "comply" with the CLUP (see, e.g., p. 43, "While the proposed Project would be required to comply with the CLUP to address potential impacts, this issue would be evaluated more fully in the EIR.") TIC suggests that the EIR clarify that the Project is reviewed for consistency with the CLUP.

8. **Energy Impacts:** The IS does not specify how energy impacts will be analyzed, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Appendix F.

Comment: Please include in the EIR an analysis of energy impacts consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Appendix F.

9. **EIR and Future Projects:** The NOP does not state whether the Specific Plan EIR will be a program-level EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, or a project-level EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15161.

Comment: We suggest that the EIR clarify that it is either a program-level EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, or a project-level EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15161. We also suggest that the Specific Plan EIR include an explanation of how it will be used for review of future projects, noting that CEQA review of future projects within the Specific Plan area may include, but not be limited to: findings that the project's impacts were sufficiently analyzed in or within the scope of the Specific Plan EIR; a determination that the project qualifies for a statutory or categorical exemption; and/or that the project requires preparation of an addendum, negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, focused EIR, tiered EIR, or subsequent EIR, as appropriate under CEQA.


*

*

*

We appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments on the NOP, and we look forward to supporting the City's process to move forward with the Peery Park Specific Plan and associated environmental review under CEQA.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carlene Matchniff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized initial 'C'.

Carlene Matchniff,

Vice President, Entitlements & Public Affairs

562 Carlisle Way
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

July 8, 2015
BY EMAIL (.PDF)

City of Sunnyvale
Department of Community Development
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

Attention: Amber El-Hajj
(ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

Re: Peery Park Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Ms. El-Hajj:

I would like the DEIR to analyze the impact of the Peery Park plan on the following public services:

- EMS-Paramedic capacity and response times
- Urgent medical care facility capacity and access times
- Emergency medical care facility capacity and access times

The traffic generated by the Peery Park plan will impact the travel times of EMS-paramedic vehicles to people in need of their services. In addition, the traffic generated by the Peery Park plan will impact the travel times of EMS-paramedic vehicles to local emergency medical care facilities. I would like the DEIR to analyze the EMS-paramedic travel times. Sunnyvale Public Safety officers are trained to provide EMS-basic service, I am requesting an analysis of the EMS-paramedic service.

The growth of Sunnyvale's population induced by the Peery Park plan will impact Sunnyvale's urgent medical care facilities. I would like the DEIR to analyze the capacity of Sunnyvale's urgent medical care facilities.

The additional people brought into Sunnyvale by the Peery Park plan will impact Sunnyvale's emergency medical care facilities. I would like the DEIR to analyze the capacity of Sunnyvale's

emergency medical care facilities.

The Peery Park plan may have a limited effect on Sunnyvale's EMS-paramedic, urgent medical care and emergency medical care, but the cumulative impact of recent and future projects in the City of Sunnyvale should also be considered.

Regards,

Martin Landzaat



**Peery Park Specific Plan
Environmental Impact Report
Scoping Meeting
June 25, 2015**

Name: Don Breitbarth
 Address: 688 W. Fernwood Circle
 Phone no: (408) 736-5713
 E-mail: _____

Please send your written/typed comments by 5:00 p.m. July 9, 2015 to the following (include a name and contact information):

Amber El-Hajj, Senior Planner
 456 W. Olive Avenue
 P.O. Box 3707
 Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707
 Or via email: ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Please comment on what environmental resources or issues should be studied within the Environmental Impact Report:

What Individual (Position) is Responsible for
the March 2015 Drawing known as "Peery Park
Specific Plan Study Area"

Why does it clearly show City Land now
Zoned M-S Industrial and Service?

When did the City Sell/Give Encinal Park and
Fire Station #1 to Private Developers?
Who was Responsible for this?

Why did the Western 1 Block of Benecia Av
become private land, Zoned M-S Industrial
and Service? Who Approved this Change?

It is Imperative that the March 2015 Peery Park Specific Plan Study Area Map be Accurately Drawn. Fire Station #1 AND Encinal Park MUST BE Outside the Study Area and Not Zoned M-S, Inside the Study Area. They Should be P-F Like the Golf Area. Benecia Ave Must Continue to belong to the City and provide an Alternate way to get to Maude Ave From the Northern Part of Mary Ave.

Information on all Planned Development Zones Inside the Study Area needs to be Included with the Peery Park Plan Study Area Materials Distributed to the Public for Study.

The City Must Adopt a Law or other Means to Insure that Every Time there is a Study Area in Sunnyvale — The Before Plan and After plan, Street Intersection "Level of Service" Grades within say a 3.0 Mile Radius of the Study Area Improve all Intersections Graded E or F to At least a Passing Level (C?). If within a specified period of time The "LOS" do not all Improve to a passing Level — Then The Specific Plan be Ruled Invalid and all development In the Study Area must be Suspended until The Formerly LOS E and F Intersections Pass.

Natural Resources and Lands Management Division
 525 Golden Gate Avenue, 10th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 T 415.554.3265
 F 415.934.5770



San Francisco Water Power Sewer

Operator of the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System

July 9, 2015

Ms. Amber El-Hajj, Senior Planner
 Community Development Department, Planning Division
 456 West Olive Avenue
 Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Dear Ms. El-Hajj:

Thank you for providing the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Peery Park Specific Plan. To assist you in the preparation of the DEIR, I am providing the following information regarding the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System.

The SFPUC manages land and water system infrastructure owned by the City and County of San Francisco as part of the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System. The SFPUC provides drinking water to 2.6 million people in the San Francisco Bay Area, including the City of Sunnyvale. The SFPUC's Bay Division Pipelines #3 and #4 bisect a portion of the Peery Park Specific Plan project area. The SFPUC's lands, pipelines, right-of-way (ROW) and infrastructure extend from the northern portion of the project area (near U.S. Highway 101) to the northwest portion of the project area (near California Highway 237).

The SFPUC ROW in the project area is primarily owned in fee, except in some instances where the SFPUC holds an easement. The primary purpose of the ROW is to operate the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System which supplies a reliable source of drinking water. Our written Commission policies do not allow the ROW to be used for structures or to meet any open space, transit or other entitlement requirements for a project. However, some of our parcels are currently licensed or leased for ancillary parking (but not to meet minimum parking requirements). In the future, any proposed project on the SFPUC ROW must participate in the SFPUC's Project Review process and obtain SFPUC approval.

For your information, I am enclosing the SFPUC ROW Encroachment Policy, Interim Recreational Use Policy for SFPUC Water Pipeline Right-of-Way, and SFPUC Integrated Vegetation Management Policy.

Finally, please add the following staff as a recipient of any future CEQA documents or notices related to this project:

Jonathan S. Mendoza
 Land and Resources Planner
JSMendoza@sfgwater.org
 (650) 652-3215

We appreciate your time and attention. If you have any questions, please contact Jonathan Mendoza.

Edwin M. Lee
 Mayor

Ann Moller Caen
 President

Francesca Vietor
 Vice President

Vince Courtney
 Commissioner

Anson Moran
 Commissioner


Ike Kwon
 Commissioner

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
 General Manager



SFPUC Response to Peery Park Specific Plan Notice of Preparation (NOP) of Draft
Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Sincerely,



Tim Ramirez

Division Manager

Natural Resources and Lands Management Division (NRLMD)

Enclosures: SFPUC ROW Encroachment Policy
Interim Recreational Use Policy for SFPUC Water Pipeline Right-of-
Way, SFPUC Integrated Vegetation Management Policy

cc: Rosanna Russell, Director, SFPUC Real Estate Services
David Briggs, Local and Regional Water Manager, SFPUC
Chris Nelson, Manager, SFPUC-WSTD
Jonathan Chow, Principal Engineer, SFPUC-WSTD
Stacie Feng, Senior Engineer, SFPUC-WSTD
Ellen Natesan, Planning and Regulatory Compliance Manager, SFPUC-NRLMD
Joanne Wilson, Senior Planner, SFPUC-NRLMD
Jane Herman, ROW Manager, SFPUC-NRLMD
Jonathan Mendoza, Planner, SFPUC-NRLMD
Sally Morgan, Planner, SFPUC-BEM

SFPUC RIGHT OF WAY ENCROACHMENT POLICY

2007

As part of its utility system, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) operates and maintains approximately 1600 miles of water pipelines and tunnels, 160 miles of electrical transmission lines, 900 miles of sewer lines and other related appurtenances that run through real property (the "Right of Way") located in San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Alameda, Tuolumne, Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties. Most of the Right of Way is owned by the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") in fee, although in some instances the City has only an easement interest for its right of way. Inside the City, most water and wastewater transmission lines are located within City streets.

Regardless of the nature of the City's property rights, it is vitally important that the SFPUC protect its water, wastewater, and power transmission facilities and ensure immediate access to all facilities for maintenance, repair, security and replacement. It is also important that the right of way be maintained so as to minimize any potential landowner liability and to prepare for the possibility of future capital improvements to the right of way.

Increased urbanization and development around the water transmission line right of way in particular has led to an increase in the number of encroachments onto the right of way. Water transmission pipelines are those that move water to SFPUC's wholesale customers located in Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and to the City of San Francisco. These encroachments threaten access, impair new construction and maintenance efforts, and increase costs and potential liabilities. Houses, garages, driveways, fences, trees, landscaped areas, vehicles and other items currently encroach onto the right of way. The SFPUC has also noticed an increase in unauthorized uses such as temporary trespasses and garbage dumping. Therefore, on September 28, 1999, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission adopted a Commercial Land Management Operating Manual that included a Right of Way (R/W) Encroachment Removal Policy published 12/14/01 and a R/W Vegetation Management Plan administered under the (R/W) Integrated Vegetation Management Policy attached hereto.

Since the original implementation of the R/W Encroachment Policy, security concerns have given additional impetus to the need to provide a safe and protected corridor for water transmission by the SFPUC. The SFPUC's concern for safety and security provides an additional foundation for the strict implementation of this policy.

Because of the length of the right of way and the importance of the encroachment removal effort, the SFPUC has determined that **intensified encroachment removal activities must commence** notwithstanding the failure to identify each and every encroachment. Accordingly, continuing identification, prevention and removal efforts shall occur simultaneously. In

SFPUC RIGHT OF WAY ENCROACHMENT POLICY

2007

addition, due to limited resources and the variation in safety and other threats posed by different encroachments, the SFPUC shall continuously prioritize known encroachments to ensure that the encroachments that pose the greatest threat to pipeline access, construction, safety and security, and encroachments that can be easily removed are addressed first. Removal efforts shall initially focus on any encroachments which would:

- (1) endanger the existing or proposed water, sewer or electrical transmission lines and appurtenances;**
- (2) impair access to facilities for emergency repair, maintenance, or operational activity;**
- (3) be detrimental to the efficient and effective maintenance of the right of way;**
- (4) cause obstruction to the inspection and monitoring of equipment, and collection of land survey, corrosion control, and water quality data; and/or**
- (5) increase liabilities to the SFPUC. It shall be the policy of the SFPUC to take any and all necessary actions to cause the removal of, or to remove, such encroachments from the right of way in accordance with this policy.**

To prevent the unauthorized use of the right of way, the SFPUC **may install fences and other barriers where prudent** or necessary as authorized by the Water Enterprise Assistant General Manager after consultation with Real Estate Services (RES). The SFPUC's goal shall be to fence as much of the right of way as is necessary to protect the SFPUC's facilities and property rights. Said fencing shall be consistent with the SFPUC's standards at the time of fence installation. The Water Enterprise, working with RES, shall have broad discretion and authority to cause the installation of fences or other barriers along the right of way in any location deemed necessary or prudent.

Ancillary uses and encroachments in the right of way may be permitted only where the uses provide identifiable benefits to the SFPUC, as determined by SFPUC Water Enterprise and RES personnel. Approval of permitted uses shall be consistent with existing SFPUC policy and shall be processed by RES.

In specific cases, the SFPUC will allow use of the right of way by third parties in order to enhance maintenance efforts and reduce maintenance costs by the SFPUC. **For example, the SFPUC provides for the leasing or permitting of portions of the right of way with nominal revenue-generating potential**

SFPUC RIGHT OF WAY ENCROACHMENT POLICY
2007

to property owners whose land is bi-sected by the SFPUC right of way, neighborhood associations, municipal governmental entities, non-profit groups and similar entities at little or no cost, provided they agree to maintain the surface of the right of way in a good and safe condition acceptable to the SFPUC and to indemnify the SFPUC for any injury or loss relating to such third-party use. It is contemplated that this effort will focus on non-commercial uses such as parks and recreation areas. Only portions of the right of way large enough to reduce the SFPUC's maintenance costs and efforts shall be considered in this regard. In areas where the right of way may be leased to private entities for parking or other commercial uses, this shall be a preferred use due to its revenue-generating capacity. All such third party rights in SFPUC property will be temporary in nature.

Policy Implementation

SFPUC RES staff will use available resources to identify and prioritize all existing unauthorized encroachments and uses. With regard to each encroachment, SFPUC RES staff will gather relevant, available information. Where any current use of right of way property is not permitted, SFPUC Water Enterprise personnel will contact RES and obtain ownership information of the encroaching party and survey information of the encroachment, if necessary. The SFPUC RES staff will notify the adjacent owner/encroacher that the use is not authorized, and such notice will identify the option or options available to the adjacent property owners/encroachers, consistent with an administrative procedure, acceptable to the SFPUC General Manager, to be prepared and implemented by RES. Depending on the nature of the encroachment, and at the sole discretion of the SFPUC, **options may include:**

- (1) immediate removal;**
- (2) removal within a specified period of time;**
- (3) possible modifications to the encroachment; and/or**
- (4) development of a permit agreement with provisions acceptable to the SFPUC.**

The administrative procedures will include attempts to resolve the encroachment through follow-up contact with the adjacent property owners/encroachers by RES. RES shall establish and chair an Internal Encroachment Review Committee (IERC) for the purpose of providing an administrative review of and proposed resolution to encroachments that may not be resolved via initial contacts between the SFPUC and the adjacent property owners/encroachers. Should administrative procedures fail or reach impasse, the SFPUC will, working with the City Attorneys'

SFPUC RIGHT OF WAY ENCROACHMENT POLICY

2007

Office, avail itself of any available remedies, including but not limited to self-help remedies and/or litigation. In particular, where the encroachment consists of trees or vegetation, or the owner of the encroachment is unknown, SFPUC RES staff may determine to cause the removal of the encroachment following notice (posting and/or mail) of the date set for removal without first requesting that the removal be performed by adjoining property owners. The SFPUC RES staff will make every effort to recover the costs of such removal from the adjacent property owners/encroachers.

For Areas that Should be Fenced as Determined by the SFPUC Water Enterprise:

1. Staff from RES will gather relevant, available information to confirm the location of the applicable SFPUC property boundaries.
2. Staff from SFPUC Communications Group will notify neighboring property owners in advance, of the SFPUC Water Enterprise's decision to install fences in the specified areas.
3. The SFPUC Water Enterprise will cause the fence or other barrier to be installed in the specified locations at the times specified in the notice above.



Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System

Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

SFPUC Interim Water Pipeline Right of Way Use Policy for San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Alameda Counties

Approved January 13, 2015

by

SFPUC Resolution No. 15-0014

as an amendment to the SFPUC Real Estate Guidelines

SFPUC Water Pipeline Right of Way Use Policy for San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Alameda Counties

As part of its utility system, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) operates and maintains hundreds of miles of water pipelines. The SFPUC provides for public use on its water pipeline property or right of way (ROW) throughout Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Mateo counties consistent with our existing plans and policies. The following controls will help inform how and in which instances the ROW can serve the needs of third parties—including public agencies, private parties, nonprofit organizations, and developers—seeking to provide recreational and other use opportunities to local communities.

Primarily, SFPUC land is used to deliver high quality, efficient and reliable water, power, and sewer services in a manner that is inclusive of environmental and community interests, and that sustains the resources entrusted to our care. The SFPUC's utmost priority is maintaining the safety and security of the pipelines that run underneath the ROW.

Through our formal Project Review and Land Use Application and Project Review process, we may permit a secondary use on the ROW if it benefits the SFPUC, is consistent with our mission and policies, and does not in any way interfere with, endanger, or damage the SFPUC's current or future operations, security or facilities.¹ No secondary use of SFPUC land is permitted without the SFPUC's consent.

These controls rely on and reference several existing SFPUC policies, which should be read when noted in the document. Being mindful of these policies while planning a proposed use and submitting an application will ease the process for both the applicant and the SFPUC. These controls are subject to change over time and additional requirements and restrictions may apply depending on the project.

The SFPUC typically issues five-year revocable licenses for use of our property, with a form of rent and insurance required upon signing.²

Note: The project proponent is referred to as the "Applicant" until the license agreement is signed, at which point the project proponent is referred to as the "Licensee."

¹ SFPUC Guidelines for the Real Estate Services Division, Section 2.0.

² SFPUC Guidelines for the Real Estate Services Division, Section 3.3.

I. Land Use, Structures, and Compliance with Law

The following tenets govern the specifics of land use, structures, and accessibility for a project. Each proposal will still be subject to SFPUC approval on a case-by-case basis.

- A. SFPUC Policies. The Applicant's proposed use must conform to policies approved by the SFPUC's Commission, such as the SFPUC's Land Use Framework (<http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=586>).
- B. Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance. The Applicant must demonstrate that a Certified Access Specialist (CASP) has reviewed and approved its design and plans to confirm that they meet all applicable accessibility requirements.
- C. Environmental Regulations. The SFPUC's issuance of a revocable license for use of the ROW is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Applicant is responsible for assessing the potential environmental impacts under CEQA of its proposed use of the ROW. The SFPUC must be named as a Responsible Agency on any CEQA document prepared for the License Area. In addition, the Applicant shall provide to SFPUC a copy of the approved CEQA document prepared by the Applicant, the certification date, and documentation of the formal approval and adoption of CEQA findings by the CEQA lead agency. The SFPUC will not issue a license for the use of the ROW until CEQA review and approval is complete.
- D. Crossover and Other Reserved Rights. For a ROW parcel that bisects a third party's land, the Applicant's proposed use must not inhibit that party's ability to cross the ROW. The Applicant must demonstrate any adjoining owner with crossover or other reserved rights approves of the proposed recreational use and that the use does not impinge on any reserved rights.
- E. Width. The License Area must span the entire width of the ROW.
 - *For example, the SFPUC will not allow a 10-foot wide trail license on a ROW parcel that is 60 feet wide.*
- F. Structures. Structures on the ROW are generally prohibited. The Licensee shall not construct or place any structure or improvement in, on, under or about the entire License Area that requires excavation, bored footings or concrete pads that are greater than six inches deep.
 - i. Structures such as benches and picnic tables that require shallow (four to six inches deep) cement pads or footings are generally permitted on the ROW. No such structure may be placed directly on top of a pipeline or within 20 feet of the edge of a pipeline.
 - ii. The SFPUC will determine the permitted weight of structures on a case-by-case basis.

- *When the SFPUC performs maintenance on its pipelines, structures of significant weight and/or those that require footings deeper than six inches are very difficult and time-consuming to move and can pose a safety hazard to the pipelines. The longer it takes the SFPUC to reach the pipeline in an emergency, the more damage that can occur.*
- G. Paving Materials. Permitted trails or walkways should be paved with materials that both reduce erosion and stormwater runoff (e.g., permeable pavers).
- H. License Area Boundary Marking. The License Area's boundaries should be clearly marked by landscaping or fencing, with the aim to prevent encroachments.
- I. Fences and Gates. Any fence along the ROW boundary must be of chain-link or wooden construction with viewing access to the ROW. The fence must include a gate that allows SFPUC access to the ROW.³ Any gate must be of chain-link construction and at least 12 feet wide with a minimum 6-foot vertical clearance.

II. ***Types of Recreational Use***

Based on our past experience and research, the SFPUC will allow simple parks without play structures, community gardens and limited trails.

- A. Fulfilling an Open Space Requirement. An applicant may not use the ROW to fulfill a development's open space, setback, emergency access or other requirements.⁴ In cases where a public agency has received consideration for use of SFPUC land from a third party, such as a developer, the SFPUC may allow such recreational use if the public agency applicant pays full Fair Market Rent.
- B. Trail Segments. At this time, the SFPUC will consider trail proposals when a multi-jurisdictional entity presents a plan to incorporate specific ROW parcels into a fully connected trail. Licensed trail segments next to unlicensed parcels may create a trail corridor that poses liability to the SFPUC. The SFPUC will only consider trail proposals where the trail would not continue onto, or encourage entry onto, another ROW parcel without a trail and the trail otherwise meet all SFPUC license requirements.

III. ***Utilities***

- A. Costs. The Licensee is responsible for all costs associated with use of utilities on the License Area.

³ SFPUC Right of Way Requirements.

⁴ SFPUC Guidelines for the Real Estate Services Division, Section 2.0.

- B. Placement. No utilities may be installed on the ROW running parallel to the SFPUC's pipelines, above or below grade.⁵ With SFPUC approval, utilities may run perpendicular to the pipelines.
- C. Lights. The Licensee shall not install any light fixtures on the ROW that require electrical conduits running parallel to the pipelines. With SFPUC approval, conduits may run perpendicular to and/or across the pipelines.
- Any lighting shall have shielding to prevent spill over onto adjacent properties.
- D. Electricity. Licensees shall purchase all electricity from the SFPUC at the SFPUC's prevailing rates for comparable types of electrical load, so long as such electricity is reasonably available for the Licensee's needs.

IV. **Vegetation**

- A. The Applicant shall refer to the SFPUC Integrated Vegetation Management Policy for the *minimum* requirements concerning types of vegetation and planting. (<http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=431>.) The Licensee is responsible for all vegetation maintenance and removal.
- B. The Applicant shall submit a Planting Plan as part of its application.
- (Community garden applicants should refer to Section VII.C for separate instructions.)*
- i. The Planting Plan should include a layout of vegetation placement (grouped by hydrozone) and sources of irrigation, as well as a list of intended types of vegetation. The SFPUC will provide an area drawing including pipelines and facilities upon request.
 - ii. The Applicant shall also identify the nursery(ies) supplying plant stock and provide evidence that each nursery supplier uses techniques to reduce the risk of plant pathogens, such as *Phytophthora ramorum*.

V. **Measures to Promote Water Efficiency**⁶

- A. The Licensee shall maintain landscaping to ensure water use efficiency.
- B. The Licensee shall choose and arrange plants in a manner best suited to the site's climate, soil, sun exposure, wildfire susceptibility and other factors. Plants with similar water needs must be grouped within an area controlled by a single irrigation valve

⁵ SFPUC Land Engineering Requirements.

⁶ SFPUC Rules and Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers, Section F.

- C. Turf is not allowed on slopes greater than 25 percent.
- D. The SFPUC encourages the use of local native plant species in order to reduce water use and promote wildlife habitat.
- E. Recycled Water. Irrigation systems shall use recycled water if recycled water meeting all public health codes and standards is available and will be available for the foreseeable future.
- F. Irrigation Water Runoff Prevention. For landscaped areas of any size, water runoff leaving the landscaped area due to low head drainage, overspray, broken irrigation hardware, or other similar conditions where water flows onto adjacent property, walks, roadways, parking lots, structures, or non-irrigated areas, is prohibited.

VI. ***Other Requirements***

- A. Financial Stability. The SFPUC requires municipalities or other established organizations with a stable fiscal history as Licensees.
 - i. Applicants must also demonstrate sufficient financial backing to pay rent, maintain the License Area, and fulfill other license obligations over the license term.
- B. Smaller, community-based organizations without 501(c)(3) classifications must partner with a 501(c)(3) classified organization or any other entity through which it can secure funding for the License Area over the license term. Maintenance. The Licensee must maintain the License Area in a clean and sightly condition at its sole cost.⁷ Maintenance includes, but is not limited to, regular weed abatement, mowing, and removing graffiti, dumping, and trash.
- C. Mitigation and Restoration. The Licensee will be responsible, at its sole cost, for removing and replacing any recreational improvements in order to accommodate planned or emergency maintenance, repairs, replacements, or projects done by or on behalf of the SFPUC. If the Licensee refuses to remove its improvements, SFPUC will remove the improvements at the Licensee's sole expense without any obligation to replace them.
- D. Encroachments. The Licensee will be solely responsible for removing any encroachments on the License Area. An encroachment is any improvement on SFPUC property not approved by the SFPUC. Please read the SFPUC ROW Encroachment Policy for specific requirements. If the Licensee fails to remove encroachments, the SFPUC will remove them at Licensee's sole expense. The Licensee must regularly patrol the License Area to spot encroachments and remove them at an early stage.

⁷ SFPUC Framework for Land Management and Use.

E. Point of Contact. The Licensee will identify a point of contact (name, position title, phone number, and address) to serve as the liaison between the Licensee, the local community, and the SFPUC regarding the License Agreement and the License Area. In the event that the point of contact changes, the Licensee shall immediately provide the SFPUC with the new contact information. Once the License Term commences, the point of contact shall inform local community members to direct any maintenance requests to him or her. In the event that local community members contact the SFPUC with such requests, the SFPUC will redirect any requests or complaints to the point of contact.

F. Community Outreach.

i. Following an initial intake conversation with the SFPUC, the Applicant shall provide a Community Outreach Plan for SFPUC approval. This Plan shall include the following information:

1. Identification of key stakeholders to whom the Applicant will contact and/or ask for input, along with their contact information;
2. A description of the Applicant's outreach strategy, tactics, and materials
3. A timeline of outreach (emails/letters mailing date, meetings, etc.); and
4. A description of how the Applicant will incorporate feedback into its proposal.

ii. The Applicant shall conduct outreach for the project at its sole cost and shall keep the SFPUC apprised of any issues arising during outreach.

iii. During outreach, the Applicant shall indicate that it in no way represents the SFPUC.

G. Signage. The SFPUC will provide, at Licensee's cost, a small sign featuring the SFPUC logo and text indicating SFPUC ownership of the License Area at each entrance. In addition, the Licensee will install, at its sole cost, an accompanying sign at each entrance to the License Area notifying visitors to contact the organization's point of contact and provide a current telephone number in case the visitors have any issues. The SFPUC must approve the design and placement of the Licensee's sign.

VII. Community Gardens

The following requirements also apply to community garden sites. As with all projects, the details of the operation of a particular community garden are approved on a case-by-case basis.

- A. The Applicant must demonstrate stable funding. The Applicant must provide information about grants received, pending grants, and any ongoing foundational support.
- B. The Applicant must have an established history and experience in managing urban agriculture or community gardening projects. Alternatively, the Applicant may demonstrate a formal partnership with an organization or agency with an established history and experience in managing urban agriculture or community gardening projects
- C. During the Project Review process, the Applicant shall submit a Community Garden Planting Plan that depicts the proposed License Area with individual plot and planter box placements, landscaping, and a general list of crops that may be grown in the garden.
- D. The Applicant shall designate a Garden Manager to oversee day-to-day needs and serve as a liaison between the SFPUC and garden plot holders. The Garden Manager may be distinct from the point of contact, see Section VI.E.
- E. The Licensee must ensure that the Garden Manager informs plot holders about the potential for and responsibilities related to SFPUC repairs or emergency maintenance on the License Area. In such circumstances, the SFPUC is not liable for the removal and replacement of any features on the License Area or the costs associated with such removal and replacement.
- F. The Licensee must conduct all gardening within planter boxes with attached bottoms that allow for easy removal without damaging the crops.



**AMENDMENT TO
RIGHT OF WAY INTEGRATED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT POLICY
Updated November 18, 2014**

**12.000 RIGHT OF WAY INTEGRATED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT
POLICY**

12.001 General

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC") is responsible for the delivery of potable water and the collection and treatment of wastewater for some 800,000 customers within the City of San Francisco; it is also responsible for the delivery of potable water to 26 other water retailers with a customer base of 1.8 million. **The following policy is established to manage vegetation on the transmission, distribution and collection systems within the SFPUC Right of Way ("ROW") so that it does not pose a threat or hazard to the system's integrity and infrastructure or impede utility maintenance and operations.**

The existence of large woody vegetation¹, hereinafter referred to as vegetation, and water transmission lines within the ROW are not compatible and, in fact, are mutually exclusive uses of the same space. Roots can impact transmission pipelines by causing corrosion. The existence of trees and other vegetation directly adjacent to pipelines makes emergency and annual maintenance very difficult, hazardous, and expensive, and increases concerns for public safety. The risk of fire within the ROW is always a concern and the reduction of fire ladder fuels within these corridors is another reason to modify the vegetation mosaic. In addition to managing vegetation in a timely manner to prevent any disruption in utility service, the SFPUC also manages vegetation on its ROW to comply with local fire ordinances enacted to protect public safety.

One of the other objectives of this policy is to reduce and eliminate as much as practicable the use of herbicides on vegetation within the ROW and to implement integrated pest management (IPM).

12.002 Woody Vegetation Management

1.0 Vegetation of any size or species will not be allowed to grow within certain critical portions of the ROW, pumping stations or other facilities as

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Ann Moller Caen
President

Francesca Vietor
Vice President

Vince Courtney
Commissioner

Anson Moran
Commissioner

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
General Manager

¹ Woody vegetation is defined as all brush, tree and ornamental shrub species planted in (or naturally occurring in) the native soil having a woody stem that at maturity exceeds 3 inches in diameter.



determined by a SFPUC qualified professional, and generally in accordance with the following guidelines.

1.1 Emergency Removal

SFPUC Management reserves the right to remove any vegetation without prior public notification that has been assessed by a SFPUC qualified professional as an immediate threat to transmission lines or other utility infrastructure, human life and property due to acts of God, insects, disease, or natural mortality.

1.2 Priority Removal

Vegetation that is within 15 feet of the edge of any pipe will be removed and the vegetative debris will be cut into short lengths and chipped whenever possible. Chips will be spread upon the site where the vegetation was removed. Material that cannot be chipped will be hauled away to a proper disposal site.

If vegetation along the ROW is grouped in contiguous stands², or populations, a systematic and staggered removal of that vegetation will be undertaken to replicate a natural appearance. Initial removal³ will be vegetation immediately above or within 15 feet of the pipeline edges; secondary vegetation⁴ within 15 to 25 feet from pipelines will then be removed.

1.3 Standard Removal

Vegetation that is more than 25 feet from the edge of a pipeline and up to the boundary of the ROW will be assessed by a SFPUC qualified professional for its age and condition, fire risk, and potential impact to the pipelines. Based on this assessment, the vegetation will be removed or retained.

1.4 Removal Standards

Each Operating Division will develop its own set of guidelines or follow established requirements in accordance with local needs.

² A stand is defined as a community of trees possessing sufficient uniformity in composition, structure, age, arrangement, or condition to be distinguishable from adjacent forest communities to form a management unit.

³ Initial removal is defined as the vegetation removed during the base year or first year of cutting

⁴ Secondary vegetation is defined as the vegetative growth during the second year following the base year for cutting.

2.0 All stems of vegetation will be cut flush with the ground and where deemed necessary or appropriate, roots will be removed. All trees identified for removal will be clearly marked with paint and/or a numbered aluminum tag.

3.0 Sprouting species of vegetation will be treated with herbicides where practicable, adhering to provisions of Chapter 3 of the San Francisco Environment Code.

4.0 Erosion control measures, where needed, will be completed before the work crew or contractors leave the work site or before October 15 of the calendar year.

5.0 Department personnel will remove in a timely manner any and all material that has been cut for maintenance purposes within any stream channel.

6.0 All vegetation removal work and consultation on vegetation retention will be reviewed and supervised by a SFPUC qualified professional. All vegetation removal work and/or treatment will be made on a case-by-case basis by a SFPUC qualified professional.

7.0 Notification process for areas of significant resource impact that are beyond regular and ongoing maintenance:

7.1 County/City Notification – The individual Operating Division will have sent to the affected county/city a map showing the sections of the ROW which will be worked, a written description of the work to be done, the appropriate removal time for the work crews, and a contact person for more information. This should be done approximately 10 days prior to start of work. Each Operating Division will develop its own set of guidelines in accordance with local need.

7.2 Public Notification – The Operating Division will have notices posted at areas where the vegetation is to be removed with the same information as above also approximately 10 days prior to removal. Notices will also be sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the removal site. Posted notices will be 11- by 17-inches in size on colored paper and will be put up at each end of the project area and at crossover points through the ROW. Questions and complaints from the public will be handled through a designated contact person. Each Operating Division will develop its own set of guidelines in accordance with local needs.

12.003 Annual Grass and Weed Management

Annual grasses and weeds will be mowed, disked, sprayed or mulched along the ROW as appropriate to reduce vegetation and potential fire danger annually. This treatment should be completed before July 30 of each year. This date is targeted to allow the grasses, forbs and weeds to reach maturity and facilitate control for the season.

12.004 Segments of ROW that are covered by Agricultural deed rights

The only vegetation that may be planted within the ROW on those segments where an adjacent owner has Deeded Agricultural Rights will be: non-woody herbaceous plants such as grasses, flowers, bulbs, or vegetables.

12.005 Segments of ROW that are managed and maintained under a Lease or License

Special allowance may be made for these types of areas, as the vegetation will be maintained by the licensed user as per agreement with the City, and not allowed to grow unchecked. Only shallow rooted plants may be planted directly above the pipelines.

Within the above segments, the cost of vegetation maintenance and removal will be borne by the tenant or licensee exclusively. In a like fashion, when new vegetative encroachments are discovered they will be assessed by a SFPUC qualified professional on a case-by-case basis and either be permitted or proposed for removal.

The following is a guideline for the size at maturity of plants (small trees, shrubs, and groundcover) that may be permitted to be used as landscape materials. Note: All distance measurements are for mature trees and plants measured from the edge of the drip-line to the edge of the pipeline.

- Plants that may be permitted to be planted directly above existing and future pipelines: shallow rooted plants such as ground cover, grasses, flowers, and very low growing plants that grow to a maximum of one foot in height at maturity.
- Plants that may be permitted to be planted 15–25 feet from the edge of existing and future pipelines: shrubs and plants that grow to a maximum of five feet in height at maturity.

- Plants that may be permitted to be planted 25 feet or more from the edge of existing and future pipelines: small trees or shrubs that grow to a maximum of twenty feet in height and fifteen feet in canopy width.

Trees and plants that exceed the maximum height and size limit (described above) may be permitted within a leased or licensed area provided they are in containers and are above ground. Container load and placement location(s) are subject to review and approval by the SFPUC.


Low water use plant species are encouraged and invasive plant species are not allowed.

All appurtenances, vaults, and facility infrastructure must remain visible and accessible at all times. All determinations of species acceptability will be made by a SFPUC qualified professional.

The above policy is for general application and for internal administration purposes only and may not be relied upon by any third party for any reason whatsoever. The SFPUC reserves the right at its sole discretion, to establish stricter policies in any particular situation and to revise and update the above policy at any time.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)

Right Of Way (ROW) Landscape Vegetation Guidelines



The following vegetation types are permitted on the ROW within the appropriate zones.

Plantings that may be permitted directly above existing and future pipelines:

Ground cover, grasses, flowers, and very low growing plants that reach no more than one foot in height at maturity.



Plantings that may be permitted 15–25 feet from the edge of existing and future pipelines:

Shrubs and plants that grow no more than five feet tall in height at maturity.



Plantings that may be permitted 25 feet or more from the edge of existing and future pipelines:

Small trees or shrubs that grow to a maximum of twenty feet in height and fifteen feet in canopy width or less.





Amber El-Hajj <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Project #2013-7653

Alkire, Martin <Martin.Alkire@mountainview.gov>

Wed, Jun 24, 2015 at 2:59 PM

To: "Amber El-Hajj (ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov)" <ael-hajj@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Cc: "Fakhry, Sayed" <Sayed.Fakhry@mountainview.gov>, "Arango, Ed" <Ed.Arango@mountainview.gov>

Hi Amber,

Regarding the NOP for the Peery Park Specific Plan project, the City would like to see the following topics addressed in the EIR analysis:

- Study intersections

Ellis/Clyde

Ellis/Middlefield

Middlefield/Ferguson

Middlefield/ Bernardo

ECR/Sylvan

ECR/Grant/Hwy 237 (CMP)

- Maps and diagrams showing how any proposed multi-modal improvements tie into existing or proposed improvements of neighboring cities

-

- Employee per SF assumptions for different land uses, with a particular emphasis on office uses

-

- A discussion of the project's jobs/housing ratio compared to the City, region, and neighboring cities

-

- A discussion of TDM requirements for new development, if any, and if part of any mitigation measure

-

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Best

Martin