

## MEMORANDUM

DATE October 8, 2014  
TO Piu Ghosh, City of Cupertino  
FROM Steve Noack, PlaceWorks  
SUBJECT General Plan Amendment, Housing Element Update, and Associated Rezoning Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Updated Late Comments Received after the 45-Day Comment Period

Table 1, below, lists and provides a brief response to written comments that were received by the City on the General Plan Amendment, Housing Element Update, and Associated Rezoning Draft EIR after the close of the public comment period. The 45-day public comment period ended on August 1, 2014. This memo responds to comments received between August 2 through October 7, 2014.<sup>1</sup> These comments are reproduced at the end of this memo. No other late comments on the Draft EIR have been received as of the date of this memo.

These comments do not contain “significant new information,” as defined in the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15088.5, which includes new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, new mitigation measures or alternatives, or information indicating that the Draft EIR is fundamentally or basically inadequate. No revisions need to be made to the Draft EIR.

---

<sup>1</sup> This memo updates our September 3, 2014 memo that addressed late comments received through August 25, 2014.

**TABLE 1: LATE COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

	Type <sup>1</sup>	Number <sup>2</sup>	Name	Date Received	Topic	Response <sup>3</sup>
1	B	LC-01	John Frey	8/8/2014	Traffic, Emergency Response, Schools, Aesthetics (increased height)	<p>Impacts to traffic congestion are discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.13-49. The cumulative impacts analysis in the EIR accounts for regional Growth. See Draft EIR, pp. 4-4 to 4-5.</p> <p>Impacts to fire protection services, police services and schools are discussed in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, beginning on pages 4.12-1, 4.12-8 and 4.12-18, respectively. Impacts to public service providers were found to be less than significant.</p> <p>Impacts due to increased height limits under the proposed Project are discussed in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. As discussed in Chapter 4.1, impacts were found to be less than significant in all areas where potential future development involving increased height is being considered. See Response to Comment B11-01 in Chapter 5 of the Response to Comments Document.</p>
2	B	LC-02	Barbara Rogers	8/25/2014	Senior Housing: Non-EIR related.	The comment is acknowledged.
3	B	LC-03	Carlene Matchniff	9/9/2014	Non-EIR related.	The comment is acknowledged.
4	B	LC-04	Dan Whisenhunt	9/8/2014	Non-EIR related.	The comment is acknowledged. Please see the responses to letter B-16 in the August 28, 2014 Response to Comments Document.
5	B	LC-05	Ruby Elbogen	9/12/2014	Water supply, schools	<p>Impacts schools are discussed in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, beginning on page 4.12-18.</p> <p>Impacts to schools were found to be less than significant.</p> <p>Impacts to water supply were discussed in Chapter 4.14,</p>

**TABLE 1: LATE COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

						Utilities and Service Systems, beginning on page 4.14-1. Water supply impacts were found to be less than significant.
6	B	LC-06	Ruby Elbogen	9/16/2014	Non-EIR related.	The comment is acknowledged.
7	B	LC-07	Sabrina Risk	9/16/2014	Non-EIR related.	The comment is acknowledged.
8	B	LC-08	Trish McAfee	9/16/2014	Traffic	Impacts to traffic congestion are discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.13-49. The cumulative impacts analysis in the EIR accounts for regional growth. See Draft EIR, pp. 4-4 to 4-5. With respect to parking, future development would be required to provide sufficient parking as required in Title 19, Zoning, Chapter 19.124, Parking Regulations of the Municipal Code.
9	B	LC-09	Steve Hill	9/16/2014	Traffic	Impacts to all modes of transportation are discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.13-49. The cumulative impacts analysis in the EIR accounts for regional growth. See Draft EIR, pp. 4-4 to 4-5.
10	B	LC-10	Phyllis Dickstein	10/6/2014	General EIR, Response to Comments Document, Water Supply, EIR Process	Impacts to water supply are discussed in Chapter 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, beginning on page 4.14-13. The cumulative impacts analysis in the EIR accounts for regional growth. See Draft EIR, pages 4-4 to 4-5. Water supply impacts were found to be less than significant.
11	B	LC-11	Kai Wetlesen	10/6/2014	Traffic	The comment is acknowledged. Table 4.13-15 is edited to include the revisions mentioned.

**Notes:**

1. The comment "type" pertains to the categories used to organize the comments submitted on the Draft EIR in the Response to Comments Document. Type A = Agencies and Service Providers and Type B = Private Individuals and Organizations;
2. The comment number LC = Late Comment. The Late Comment letters are attached to this memo.
3. The "response" column references responses provided in the Response to Comments Document, published on August 28, 2014.



From: John Frey [mailto:johnfreyca@comcast.net]  
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2014 9:58 PM  
To: City Council  
Subject: Growth and the straining of our services .

Dear Honorable City Council Members,

I am writing you on my concerns about our growth and straining of our services. I have lived in Cupertino for approximately 22 years and grew up in Mtn. View / Palo Alto. I have firsthand witnessed how Silicon Valley changed from the orchards I rode my bike through to the concrete jungle we now live in. I truly understand businesses need to grow and that they provide valuable tax revenue to Cupertino. But when I see our businesses being bulldozed then replaced with buildings with businesses on the bottom and APARTMENTS / CONDOS above them, it is a bit upsetting.

Is our City Planning strategy to become like San Francisco or San Jose? Or are we going to make Cupertino one of the most balanced Cities in Santa Clara? Where businesses are welcomed and residents have a safe beautiful neighborhood to raise their children in. When we approve plans to build these high rises we take away from this. We put more cars on our roads, more calls for service from our Deputies and Fire / Paramedics, and more children in our schools. All but one of which, I have not seen any growth in. Our roads have not gotten wider, there are no more Deputies patrolling though their beats have increased. This also can be said about our Fire / Paramedics too. We do have construction on new classrooms (etc.) in our schools but these schools are in established neighborhoods that were designed for single family homes back in 60's, 70's, and part of the 80's. Traffic around these schools are becoming a parking lot. Blocking city residents from being able to exit their neighborhoods and sometime their own driveways.

I have personally talked to Deputies who have stated to me that if they work in the west end of Cupertino and a call comes out on the east end of Cupertino, they know it can take up to 30 mins. or more depending on the time of day. When you approve apartments / condos above old businesses, you indirectly create a whole new beat for each floor added. This adds many more calls for service with the same amount of Deputies we have had since I moved here back in 90's with no one to replacing the vacuum. We need more Deputies!

I know we are building a "new downtown" off of Stevens Creek Blvd. I also know we are building the new Apple 2 building off of Wolfe. These are huge projects and will bring more strain on our services and way of life here in Cupertino. Some for the good and I feel more for the bad. The bad is the high density housing and traffic! It really has to stop, we cannot support any more of these projects without destroying our way of life here in Cupertino. If a single family home has to cost 2 million dollars, then unfortunately it is the cost of living here in Cupertino. We have no more room for this type of high density growth! Or are we going the way of being the San Francisco of the South Bay? I know every one of my neighbors feel the same way about limiting the growth. I know a few years ago we had a petition passed that City Hall cannot approve any construction above 3 stories without voter approval (correct me if I am wrong). That was due to the big eye sore at the Crossroads (Stevens Creek and De Anza) being built with high density housing. Please, don't make the citizens of Cupertino have to speak up again.

All of you live here and represent us. Control the Planning Commission and preserve what is left of our city community!

Thank you for your consideration to this matter!

Respectfully,

John Frey

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Rogers [mailto:barbsbucket@comcast.net]  
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 3:04 PM  
To: Christopher Valenzuela  
Subject: Re: Aug. 28 Housing Commission Meeting

Hi, C.J. and thanks for your courtesy.

I'm sorry I didn't see reference to senior housing in the staff report.  
But glad it was there--and not surprised that it would have been included.  
As the City is fortunate to have excellent members of staff.

Please accept my apologies for not reading well enough to find the staff reference.  
And extend my apologies, as appropriate.

Thnx, again, C.J. Love, BR

On Aug 25, 2014, at 2:08 PM, Christopher Valenzuela <ChristopherV@cupertino.org> wrote:

Hi Barbara, I have forwarded your comment below to the Housing Commission as I didn't see the Housing Commission included on your prior e-mail. Thank you.

Christopher "C.J." Valenzuela, Senior Housing Planner City Hall  
Community Development Department  
10300 Torre Ave  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
408-777-3251 (Phone)  
christopherv@cupertino.org (E-mail)  
www.cupertino.org (Website)

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Rogers [mailto:barbsbucket@comcast.net]  
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 1:03 PM  
To: Christopher Valenzuela; City of Cupertino Fine Arts  
Cc: Gary Chao; Aarti Shrivastava  
Subject: Aug. 28 Housing Commission Meeting

To: Housing Commission Chair Raman and Members Wilson, Barnett, Chu, and Maroko—  
I am very sorry to not be able to attend your meeting this Thurs. Aug. 28 at 9:00.  
I have a conflict on 2nd and also on 4th Thurs. mornings, unfortunately.

Therefore, I'm emailing my input which I hope you will adopt in some form in your recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Specifically, I look at the Housing Element section of the staff report for your meeting this Thurs. morning.

I find no reference to older adult (senior) housing and the need for it.  
Perhaps I may have overlooked something in the long, well-written report.  
I did testify at several of the workshops where it seemed to me that my comments were welcomed and would be included.

I ask that you include some reference to the need for older adult housing in Cupertino, as well as housing for all segments of the population, in your recommendations to the Planning Commission.

And not just below-market-rate and subsidized housing but also for-profit units.  
There is ample documentation of this need which exists all over the country and is growing.  
I've made available to staff material relative to successful for-profit and subsidized senior housing projects constructed in the Bay Area, across the U.S. and world-wide.

This need for senior housing, both government-assisted and also for profit, is growing in Cupertino, as elsewhere, as the senior demographic is burgeoning.  
I hope that in recognizing this need in Cupertino you will recommend for the City of Cupertino to increase the housing available in Cupertino for older adults.

Thanks, again, for all you do to benefit our community and its residents-- that you care enough to give of your time and expertise and make a difference for the better.

I look forward to welcoming you to the Sept. 30 Forum Aging-in-Place.  
Thnx, again, Love, BR



September 4, 2014

Ms. Piu Ghosh, Senior Planner  
City of Cupertino  
10300 Torre Avenue  
Cupertino, CA 95014

Dear Ms. Ghosh,

The intent of this letter is to reinforce that The Irvine Company (TIC) has a strong desire to plan the future redevelopment of the Hamptons in full cooperation with Apple, including but not limited to security, height, landscape buffering, and amenities that could serve possible future Apple employees that may choose to reside within close proximity of their employment.

From the beginning of our dialogue with Apple, we were encouraged that providing additional housing near the Apple Campus 2 (AC2) would create an opportunity to reduce auto trips for employees living within walking and bicycling distance to AC2. In fact, the AC2 EIR includes a mitigation measure, which requires Apple to expand the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program to reduce traffic impacts. This TDM Program expansion requires implementation of TDM measures that increase Apple's non-single occupant vehicle mode to 34% at full occupancy of the site. The GPA's proposed increase of housing units for the Hamptons site will provide a significant increase in housing within a short walking/ bicycling distance to AC2, helping Apple achieve this TDM requirement.

Recently, management at TIC were surprised to read the letter Apple sent to the City, since prior to that, the two companies had an otherwise amicable and cooperative relationship over the years. That cooperation began with a significant amount of coordination between TIC and Apple during the period in which the AC2 DEIR was being prepared, circulated for public comment, and certified by the City of Cupertino. This coordination took place between 2011 and 2013 and culminated with the execution of two separate agreements between Apple and TIC (a Land Swap Agreement and a Construction Impact Mitigation Agreement).

During the winter of 2011, Apple approached TIC regarding the expected need to mitigate the traffic impacts associated with development of AC2. They expected that EIR mitigation for the project would include the widening of North Wolfe Road between Pruneridge Avenue and I-280, requiring right of way from the Hamptons. In addition, their proposed AC2 development included the closure of Pruneridge Avenue between the Hampton's access and North Tantau Avenue. Apple communicated to the Company that it was their desire, as well as the City of Cupertino's, that the Company and Apple reach agreement on this North Wolfe Road widening and Pruneridge Avenue closure prior to the City Council's approval of the AC2 project and certification of their project EIR.

Over the course of nearly two years, Apple and TIC resolved a number of issues to address the impacts associated with the North Wolfe Road widening and the vacation of Pruneridge Avenue. These included the design parameters of the North Wolfe roadway widening (i.e. number and width of lanes), the design parameters of that portion of Pruneridge Avenue that would remain between the Hamptons access and North Wolfe Road, review of future landscaping plans for the edge conditions surrounding the Hamptons, trail and sidewalk requirements, and right of way compensation. These discussions concluded with execution of a Land Swap Agreement between the parties in November 2013 and eliminated any need for the City of Cupertino to use its powers of eminent domain to acquire the needed right of way along North Wolfe Road. In the end, TIC agreed to dedicate access to Apple, Inc. in a Land Swap for the price of \$100.

Our cooperation also went beyond the issue of required access. In May 2013, the DEIR for AC2 was circulated to the public. After TIC's review of the DEIR, we believed that a number of environmental issues had not been adequately addressed. TIC informed Apple of our concerns three weeks prior to the close of the DEIR review period. Apple requested that TIC and Apple execute a side agreement to address our concerns in lieu of submitting a formal DEIR comment letter to the City of Cupertino. Over the next three weeks, we engaged in a series of communications with Apple to discuss our issues. This coordination culminated in the execution of a Construction Impact Mitigation Agreement between the parties in July 2013. This Agreement dealt with a number of issues including:

- Commitment by TIC to not write a DEIR comment letter
- Spillover parking into Hamptons
- Maintaining emergency access to the Hamptons site at all time
- Uses permitted in nearby Landscape Maintenance Building on AC2 site
- Noise limits from Central Plant
- Limitations on use of Pruneridge for construction traffic
- Weekend construction impacts, Dust control
- Design of temporary noise wall and Lighting shields

Despite TIC's general concern about the increased traffic associated with the AC2 project and the impacts associated with reduced accessibility to the Hamptons site caused by the closure of a section of Pruneridge, TIC was willing to work with Apple to eliminate the need to raise concerns during the DEIR and hearing process. Even though our residents are inconvenienced on a daily basis by the noise, truck traffic, dust, and general inconvenience of the construction, we have honored all prior agreements.

Now, as we explore future redevelopment of our site, and prior to filing plans for a specific project, Apple has expressed concern in writing to the City, and also testified against redevelopment of our site at a recent Housing Commission meeting. We wish to assure the City that TIC is willing to reduce heights to 60 feet along the Apple boundary and will design the future proposal within a 60 to 75 foot range with taller heights along the freeway and stepping down the heights on Wolfe Road and along Apple's boundary. With respect to Apple's privacy concerns, TIC is committed to incorporating appropriate setbacks, landscape buffering, and design features into the design of the Hamptons redevelopment, in order to respect the privacy of AC2. In fact, we have already engaged Apple's landscape architect, Olin, with Apple's permission, to assure Apple that we would plant adequate trees and foliage to screen and buffer views from AC2 to the Hamptons site and vice versa.

Regarding traffic, it is worth noting, a positive community benefit of redevelopment of the Hamptons, is related to Section 3.14 of the Apple Development Agreement. This section requires their payment of \$1,000,000 towards a transportation study of Wolfe Road between Homestead and Stevens Creek including widening of the Wolfe Road overcrossing at I-280. (Apple told us that they had already paid the City this study funding). However, subject to the outcome of the study, the City and Apple are to determine funding options to implement the recommended improvements from this transportation study. One of those funding options is recognized in Section 3.14 to be a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). Further, Section 3.14 gives the City sole discretion in making the findings with the study and the funding mechanisms. In light of this requirement, any development in the Wolfe corridor, including redevelopment of the Hamptons will necessitate the preparation of the Wolfe interchange study and will kick off the process for forming the potential funding mechanism for the improvements in this area. This is a positive benefit for the community as the Wolfe interchange is in need of study. TIC recognizes that our project, should it move forward, would be subject to an appropriate contribution to this funding district.

Our goal is to continue to work with Apple on a myriad of issues that require cooperation between our two adjacent property owners, and to do so in a professional manner. We appreciate the considerable efforts of the City to develop the General Plan Amendment, Housing Element update, related zoning changes, and EIR, as well as your consideration of the facts presented in this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require additional information.

Sincerely,



Carlene Matchniff  
Vice President Entitlements & Public Affairs  
The Irvine Company

cc: Mayor and City Council of Cupertino  
David Brandt, City Manager  
Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager & Director of Community Development



September 8, 2014

Piu Ghosh  
Senior Planner  
City of Cupertino  
10300 Torre Avenue  
Cupertino, CA 95014

**RE: Citywide General Plan Amendment Proposed Resolution- Hamptons Site**

Dear Piu,

We were pleased to read the letter from The Irvine Company ("TIC") confirming its intent to respect Apple's privacy and security needs in any future redevelopment of the Hamptons site. The language quoted below from TIC's letter also confirms that TIC does not want the 85 foot height limit, with no setbacks, as currently drafted in the General Plan Amendment ("GPA"):

*"We wish to assure the City that TIC is willing to reduce heights to 60 feet along the Apple boundary and will design the future proposal with a 60 to 75 foot range with taller heights along the freeway and stepping down the heights on Wolfe Road and along Apple's boundary. With respect to Apple's privacy concerns, TIC is committed to incorporating appropriate setbacks, landscaped buffering, and design features into the then design of the Hamptons redevelopment, in order to respect the privacy of AC2."*

The bottom line is that Apple and TIC are on the same page, but this isn't yet reflected in the current draft of the GPA. As currently proposed, the GPA permits heights up to 85 feet with no requirement for setbacks or other buffers. This seriously damages Apple, and doesn't benefit TIC, since TIC does not require the additional height to redevelop the Hamptons site. We appreciate that the City recognized Apple's multi-billion dollar investment in Cupertino and respected our security and privacy requirements during the approval process for AC2, as reflected in the EIR and project approval findings. The City should continue to live up to that commitment by revising the GPA and adopting the specific language we previously proposed, and shown below.

*"The height limit for the structures located within 50 feet of the parcel line abutting adjacent commercial properties or Pruneridge shall not exceed 60 feet. The height limit shall not exceed 60 feet for the remainder of the Hamptons site, unless the City makes special findings that an increased height, up to a maximum of 75 feet, would not infringe on the privacy and security needs of adjacent neighbors, nor unreasonably impact view corridors or sunlight, or create light or glare trespass. This may require any future development of the site to include transitions, landscaping, or other mitigations, so that the City can make the special findings specified above."*

Apple  
1 Infinite Loop  
MS 21-1AC2  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
T 408 996-1010  
F 408996-0275  
www.apple.com

It's vital for the City to address this issue now. Otherwise, the City may have unintentionally limited its discretion to address project-level concerns after adopting higher density limits in the GPA. For example, California law provides that the density of a proposed project complying with the applicable General Plan, zoning and development policies cannot be reduced unless the City makes specific written findings that a reduction in density is needed to avoid health or safety effects. Gov. Code sec. 65589.5(j). There is also a streamlined CEQA review for residential projects that are consistent with the General Plan, in which only impacts that are "peculiar" to the project are analyzed. Pub. Res. Code sec. 21083.3. Therefore, the City should set forth in the GPA the key issues that need to be taken into account in considering potential redevelopment of the Hamptons site, since deferring this step may unduly bind the City in the future. We believe the language we proposed does that, and is consistent with TIC's statements regarding its plans for the Hamptons site.

Kind regards,



Dan Whisenhunt

Senior Director  
Real Estate & Development  
Apple

cc: Mayor and City Council of Cupertino  
Planning Commission of Cupertino  
David Brandt, City Manager  
Aarti Shrivastava, Director of Community Development

**From:** Ruby Elbogen <rgelbogen@aol.com>  
**Date:** September 12, 2014 at 8:06:04 AM PDT  
**To:** gwong212@aol.com  
**Subject:** Mr. Mayor - "Hell No, I Won't Go"

Dear Mr. Mayor - As I watched the Planning Commission meeting last evening, and assumed the Irvine Company was pulling a prank on the Commissioners by telling them that the Company from The OC is planning to add 800-ish (give or take 3) apartments to what they already have here--I laughed and waited for the punch line. Little did I know the joke is on us. So, when this is approved--are we expected to give up OUR water for them, as well as for Apple--so they can flush their thousands of new toilets? If not, where will the water come from? And, where will their kids go to school--even though it's not the City Council's problem, so to speak, you will still be blamed for letting it happen. You could tell the Irvine Company to go back to Disneyland. Thanks, Ruby

Thanks & Regards,  
Ruby Elbogen,  
Editor/Publisher The C Magazine & Cupertino-News.com  
408/355-0575

From: Ruby Elbogen [mailto:rgelbogen@aol.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2014 8:54 AM  
To: George Schroeder  
Subject: The Fence Between Vallco & Our Neighborhood

Hi, George - Rumor has it that Apple, the City and/or some other entity wants to take down the fence between Vallco and our neighborhood. Our home is on No. Portal. I can only assume that all the people involved, who are fairly new to Cupertino are unaware of Propositions D & E--and the fact that our neighborhood fought a huge war to keep that fence up. And, does the City and Apple, etc. realize how dumb the premise is that in order to promote Walkability those who want to turn our area of Cupertino into what it doesn't want to be--a friggin' Pass Through for Apple employees --who profess Walkability, but who can't or won't walk around our very nice quiet area? We want to nip this in the bud early, but we can gather a crowd to make it an issue. What is your advice? Cheers, Ruby

Thanks & Regards,  
Ruby Elbogen,  
Editor/Publisher The C Magazine & CMagazineOnline.com  
408/355-0575

# COMMENT CARD

Please fill out this card with any comments you have related to the Draft 2040 General Plan and Housing Element. The City will include all comments in upcoming Planning Commission and City Council staff reports. You can also submit comments online at [www.cupertinoogpa.org](http://www.cupertinoogpa.org) or via email to: [planning@cupertino.org](mailto:planning@cupertino.org).

## Contact Information

Name: Sabrina Rizk Phone # or Email: (650) 404-7999

Address: 11568 Raintree Spring Ct City: Cupertino State: CA

Comments: I support more housing for all income brackets  
and for both those who want to buy or rent. Without  
more housing the cost of housing will continue to  
increase, driving families who want to stay in Cupertino  
out. We need to address the reality that this is where  
jobs are being created and the new employees need a place  
to live.

I also support better cell and internet coverage in  
Cupertino as this has become a safety issue for me.  
We only have cell phones and need good coverage in case  
there is an emergency with our kids or ourselves.

I support water conservation and other initiatives  
that reduce the impact of climate change.

I support multi-modal methods of transportation - especially  
those connecting civic sites Sabrina Rizk



# COMMENT CARD

Please fill out this card with any comments you have related to the Draft 2040 General Plan and Housing Element. The City will include all comments in upcoming Planning Commission and City Council staff reports. You can also submit comments online at [www.cupertino.org](http://www.cupertino.org) or via email to: [planning@cupertino.org](mailto:planning@cupertino.org).

## Contact Information

Name: Trish McAfee Phone # or Email: pamcafee1942@yahoo.com

Address: 10140 North Blaney City: Cupertino State: Ca

## Comments:

We who live North Blaney between De Anza Blvd + Wolfe are feeling squeezed + hemmed in. Most of the increased housing is in our area yet there is a plan to add 38 apartments on the corner of Blaney + Stevens Creek. Already we have increased traffic from the Biltmore addition.

- We have lost 2 dry cleaners who were close by and located within walking distance. Now we have to get in our car + drive.
- School traffic to Collins + Lawson is so bad that we can't get in + out of our driveway during <sup>commut</sup> ~~commut~~ other streets are blocked.
- More cars are coming down Blaney because of increased traffic on Wolfe Road + De Anza. some form

Maybe we need rent control in the Sunnyvale Cupertino area. Some of these landlords are very greedy + only doing short term leases + raising rents every time.

*P.A. McAfee*

# COMMENT CARD

Please fill out this card with any comments you have related to the Draft 2040 General Plan and Housing Element. The City will include all comments in upcoming Planning Commission and City Council staff reports. You can also submit comments online at [www.cupertino.org](http://www.cupertino.org) or via email to: [planning@cupertino.org](mailto:planning@cupertino.org).

## Contact Information

Name: Steve Hill Phone # or Email: sghill3@yahoo.com

Address: 8179 Presidio Dr City: Cupertino State: CA

- Comments:
1. Consider intra-city taxi/shuttle service instead of bus.  
Taxi/shuttle = door to door. Bus = walk to/from bus stops at each end of  
trip. Shuttle could operate like Super Shuttle - pool riders to spread out  
costs.
  2. Need raised bike lanes like in some European cities. Need to  
get bikes off of streets. Green paint helps, but there is still  
safety risks.
  3. Inadequate parking lots at Marketplace, BJs, Pineria, Armadillo Willy's, etc  
constitute a rationing system. You can't eat there if lot is full,  
even though there are empty tables => Negative effect on quality  
of life. The City needs to stop approving commercial  
developments with inadequate parking.
  4. Explore using MTC's flow database to learn more about  
the City's car traffic: a) intra city b) city to outside  
c) outside to city d) through traffic.  
MTC purchased flow data from mobile phone carriers.

**From:** Dicksteinp@aol.com [mailto:Dicksteinp@aol.com]

**Sent:** Monday, October 06, 2014 10:17 AM

**To:** Gilbert Wong; Rod Sinks; Orrin Mahoney; Barry Chang; Mark Santoro

**Cc:** travigne-villas-hoa@googlegroups.com; faridakhan123@yahoo.com; pamcafee1942@yahoo.com; betspix@gmail.com; amars10@hotmail.com; rgelbogen@aol.com

**Subject:** Council EIR session Tue Oct 7 4-6:30pm

Gentlemen:

Since I will probably be late for tomorrow's meeting, which is beginning rather early, I am submitting, or reiterating, some comments in advance.

1) The EIR is a bit of a whitewash. That is, the facts are there but the conclusions need to be taken with a large grain of salt. Impacts on traffic, air pollution and water supply that are reported as "less than significant" by the authors may not be so regarded by the ordinary residents of Cupertino.

2) The responses to the comments on the EIR are a series of justifications -- was there ever any acknowledgement that in a particular instance the commenter might be right and therefore something ought to be scaled back?

3) I have already spoken at length about the impact on traffic and air quality of further housing development on Blaney Avenue, but now, once again, I wish to address water supply.

4) Water is already being rationed north of here, while the latest issue of *Cupertino Scene* is urging residents to conserve water and suggesting several ways to do so. Yet what good does it do for us to take shorter showers if in the end water is not being conserved but simply transferred to thousands of new apartments and offices? Climate change is not going away and the figures provided in the EIR for a five-year drought situation belie their sanguine conclusions.

5) I am unclear as to what will happen on November 3. I hope that the final Plan will not be adopted the day before the elections! Many Silicon Valley residents work long hours and cannot attend an endless series of meetings but they do vote. Any final decisions should wait.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Dickstein

Travigne Villas

From: <info@cupertinogpa.org>  
Date: Mon, Oct 6, 2014 at 8:57 PM  
Subject: Comment from City of Cupertino General Plan Amendment Website  
To: info@cupertinogpa.org

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Kai Wetlesen  
Organization: None Given  
Email: kwetlesen@mac.com

Possibly Regarding Page:

/documents/view/195

Subject:

Error in General Plan Amendment, page 4.13-25

Comment:

regarding:

The General Plan

Hello,

The headways cited in 4.13-15 are not correct according to VTA timetables within the Cupertino city limits. The following corrections should be made to the headways table:

23: 10 to 12 minutes  
25: 20 to 30 minutes  
26: 30 minutes  
55: 30 minutes

Regards,  
Kai Wetlesen