

From: Kitty Moore
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Hills at Vallco CEQA
Date: Thursday, June 07, 2018 2:33:04 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[Vallco2M800unit_Program_Level_EIR_Problem.pdf](#)

Dear Ms. Ghosh,

I would still like to have the ITE trip generation tables, traffic counts and dates from the GPA 2040 DEIR certified 12/4/2014. I requested them over a year ago.

In addition, no one has yet clarified what the city had studied at Vallco. The DEIR for Vallco Specific Plan circulated March 24, 2018 states, on page 7, PDF 43, footnote 6:

6 The General Plan EIR analyzed the demolition of the existing 1,207,774 square foot mall and redevelopment of the site with up to 600,000 square feet of commercial uses, 2.0 million square feet of office uses, 339 hotel rooms, and 800 residential dwelling units within the Vallco Special Area.

Source:

Vallco DEIR. "Draft Environmental Impact Report, Vallco Special Area Specific Plan, SCH# 2018022021." Cupertino, 24 May 2018. <<http://www.cupertino.org/our-city/departments/community-development/planning/major-projects/vallco>>.

I have made several requests about what was actually studied in the DEIR for the General Plan Amendment process because it appears now to be very clear that the city engaged in piecemeal planning and delivered benefits to developer in the GPA process. Is that a correct assessment?

Attached is an analysis of what has been communicated regarding what was studied in the DEIR for the General Plan Amendment in 2014 vs. what was apparently quite privately studied, this has been sent to the city last month.

Here is the conclusion:

Conclusion:

There appears to be either a non-disclosure of the contents of the General Plan EIR, which would be highly inappropriate, or a serious misunderstanding in the developer and consultants' belief that 2 Million SF of office and 800 residential units were studied at Vallco in the General Plan Amendment EIR. Neither of these options are good. Please conduct a thorough review which shall include requesting exactly what Hexagon was told to study for the Vallco site specifically. Other consultants for the EIR would also have needed to know where the office and housing allocations were to be spread around the city and would be able to confirm what they were told to analyze. Additionally, the city staff should be asked what they told the developer as to what had been analyzed in the EIR to determine why the developer believes/believed they had studied the 2 Million SF of office and 800 residential units. Lastly, it is very disconcerting that the consultant for the current Vallco EIR believe the 2 Million SF and 800 residential units had already been studied at the Vallco site, was the 9212 report inaccurate in many places? Will the current Vallco EIR be full of inaccuracies?

Please make findings public.

Sincerely,

Kitty Moore

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kitty Moore** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Apr 17, 2017 at 8:07 AM

Subject: Hills at Vallco CEQA

To: piug@cupertino.org

Hello,

I am researching the CEQA process for the Hills at Vallco and I want to know what the trigger was which got Fehr + Peers contracted early 2015 to conduct a traffic study. The formal announcement to the DEIR came out October 16, 2015.

So I'd like to understand why the time lag. I have found some information on CEQA but the trigger question is not clear.

I am concerned that the city initiated Citizen's Advisory Committee, which is not developer initiated, will be used as a reason to restart the DEIR.

I have read the F+P analysis of Kimley-Horn's traffic study for the EA for Vallco Initiative for the 9212. I concur with most of the problems they found and excess traffic. They did not break apart retail by restaurants or theaters and that will get picked apart. Additionally F+Ps counts are now too old, and the commuter lot and Chevrolet storage on the site may not be counted as a mall usage in the future traffic study. Nor may the mall occupancy be estimated, it is the mall owner's responsibility to maintain tenants, by allegedly telling them erroneously that the mall demolition would start January 2017, he caused the traffic study counts to come down further. That was his choice.

I am also reviewing the incomplete GPA 2040 DEIR which was certified 12/4/2014. Who

reviewed the traffic portion in the city and "signed off" on it? Please give me their contact information and have the count dates and sheets emailed along with the ITE trip generation tables of calculated daily trips. I don't see how anyone could have signed off in what was posted online and that should have had a CEQA challenge, I am sure you agree.

Thank you,

Kitty Moore

sent from my iPhone

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: piug@cupertino.org [Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: [REDACTED]

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.