

Scott, Shawna

From: Kim Murry [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2019 1:17 PM
To: Scott, Shawna
Cc: Bell Jr., Charles
Subject: Froom Ranch Draft EIR

Shawna

I have reviewed the FRSP draft EIR (albeit not in the detail I would have hoped to do) and have some questions in no particular order. I assume the staff with the appropriate technical expertise will be weighing in on their particular sections, but as a citizen, it would be helpful to have the project DEIR address some clarifications.

Also, while I realize this is not a review of the project itself, I would just note that many of the mitigation measures required include significant amounts of monitoring (staff time commitment) which I hope will be addressed as the project moves forward.

1. In the executive summary page 2 the traffic analysis chart shows the hotel included as a residential land use versus a commercial one - is this consistent with how the city has handled hotel traffic analysis for other projects?
2. Assisted living and memory care uses are evaluated for resident- generated impacts but it's not clear how the EIR address employee-related impacts associated with these facilities.
3. Visual analysis - I assume the story poles show height above proposed finish grade and not natural grade (given the amount of fill being brought in). It would be helpful to clarify this in the report.
4. Visual analysis - Figure 11 in the COSE shows a cone of view for the site originates closer to Highway 101. It would be helpful to have some discussion that addresses why site #5 in the visual analysis didn't use that location.
5. Airport Land Use Plan - the DEIR relies on the 2014 Johnson report and indicates that this approach was appropriate for San Luis Ranch and Avila Ranch. However, my understanding is that the other two specific plans were consistent with the LUCE for which that report was generated. A little more discussion might be helpful to more fully explain why this information is still appropriate given the update to the Airport Layout Plan in July 2017 after the ALUC reviewed the conceptual plan in April of 2017. The DEIR discussion on page 3-7 40 seems a little thin when it concludes that the ALUC will review the project and ensure the development doesn't pose a risk and therefore the impact is less than significant. The discussion doesn't refer to any directional items or comments provided in response to the conceptual review on 4-19-2017. If this is covered in the comments section from other agencies it might be helpful to reference it.
6. Parkland- mitigation measure PS-2 refers to 1.6 acres of public parkland but should be clarified that it is in addition to the 2.9 acres included as part of the project description.
7. Parkland - It appears that amount of parkland was evaluated. I may have missed it but I didn't see a discussion of potential impacts associated with the location of the proposed park. For example noise from truck deliveries, connectivity, or consistency with the Parks and Recreation Element for types of park facilities and location of those facilities.
8. Public Services- additional calls for Fire Dept. services. Some discussion about how multiple calls from existing senior communities are currently handled would be helpful. Are they charged for service?
9. Table ES-2 - why are cultural impacts associated with the no project alternative listed as greater than those associated with the proposed project?
10. Page 2-53 Annexation - please clarify why is this assumed to be a city-initiated annexation?
11. Page 3-9 43 - 8.6.3 discussion indicates that site is not designated as open space. However, it does contain open space resources and the discussion should reflect that. The discussion also mentions in-lieu fees in relation to an agricultural easement. This could use further clarification.
12. Transportation 2 - it may be helpful to indicate how existing employer ridership programs have been implemented and any lessons learned about what works and what hasn't been as effective. On-going monitoring is always challenging with these types of private programmatic approaches.

13. Timing - the DEIR indicates project construction will occur between 2020-2024 with occupancy in 2025.

Given the multiple agency review and approval process, is this still accurate? If not, does this affect timing of when certain mitigations will be triggered?

Thanks for all of your work on this project and for making sure the EIR provides the information our decision makers will need when it comes forward for review.

Kim Murry

Sent from my iPad