

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Responses to Comments document contains comments received during the public review period of the 14789 Oka Road Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND).

According to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15073 and 15074, the lead agency must consider the comments received during consultation and review periods together with the IS/MND. However, unlike with an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), comments received on an IS/MND are not required to be attached to the negative declaration, nor must the lead agency provide written responses to public agencies. Nonetheless, the lead agency has chosen to provide responses to the comments for consideration by the Town decision-makers.

BACKGROUND

The Town of Los Gatos used the following methods to solicit public input on the IS/MND: a Notice of Completion of the IS/MND was posted with the State Clearinghouse on March 6, 2026. The IS/MND was distributed to applicable public agencies, responsible agencies, and interested individuals. In addition, copies of the document were made available at the Los Gatos Public Library, located at 100 Villa Avenue and at the Los Gatos Community Development Department and the Clerk’s Office at 110 East Main Street. Electronic copies of the IS/MND were also available on the Town’s website at the following page: www.losgatosca.gov/14789Oka. The public review period ended April 6, 2026.

LIST OF COMMENTERS

The Town of Los Gatos received nine comment letters during the public review period of the IS/MND for the proposed project. The comment letters were received from the following agencies and individuals, and are included in the Responses to Comments section below:

Agencies

- Letter 1 California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Letter 2 Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD)

Individuals

- Letter 3 Mario Blaum
- Letter 4 Carolyn Drozdiak (1 of 2)
- Letter 5 Carolyn Drozdiak (2 of 2)
- Letter 6 Jim Drozdiak
- Letter 7 Lana Gerasimova
- Letter 8 Richard Henning
- Letter 9 Diana Schnabel

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The Responses to Comments below include each comment letter received regarding the 14789 Oka Road Project IS/MND, as well as responses to each comment. Each bracketed comment letter has been numbered at the top and bracketed to indicate how the letter has been divided



into individual comments. Each comment is given a number with the letter number appearing first, followed by the comment number. For example, the first comment in Letter 1 would have the following format: 1-1. The response to each comment will reference the comment number.

Where revisions to the IS/MND text were made, new text is double underlined and deleted text is ~~struck through~~. All such revisions to the IS/MND are minor and merely clarify, amplify, or make insignificant modifications that do not affect the adequacy of the conclusions presented therein. CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5 states the following regarding recirculation requirements for negative declarations:

- (c) Recirculation is not required under the following circumstances:
 - (1) Mitigation measures are replaced with equal or more effective measures pursuant to Section 15074.1.
 - (2) New project revisions are added in response to written or verbal comments on the project's effects identified in the proposed negative declaration which are not new avoidable significant effects.
 - (3) Measures or conditions of project approval are added after circulation of the negative declaration which are not required by CEQA, which do not create new significant environmental effects and are not necessary to mitigate an avoidable significant effect.
 - (4) New information is added to the negative declaration which merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications to the negative declaration.

Based on the above, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5, recirculation of the IS/MND is not warranted.



CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 4
OFFICE OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING
P.O. BOX 23660, MS-10D | OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
www.dot.ca.gov



April 6, 2026

SCH #: 2026030319
GTS #: 04-SCL-2026-01489
GTS ID: 39394
Co/Rt/Pm: SCL/85/R10.697

Erin Walters, Senior Planner
Town of Los Gatos
110 E. Main Street
Los Gatos, CA 95030

Re: 14789 Oka Road Project – Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)

Dear Erin Walters:

1-1

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the 14789 Oka Road Project. The Local Development Review (LDR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities. The following comments are based on our review of the March 2025 Draft IS/MND.

Please note this correspondence does not indicate an official position or approval by Caltrans on this project and is for informational purposes only.

1-2

Project Understanding

The proposed project would include the removal of the existing orchard to allow for the subdivision of the site into 18 residential lots and subsequent development of 138 townhome units within 18 residential buildings. The project also proposes construction of a new sidewalk, planting strip, on-street parking, and a bike lane along the Oka Road frontage. The approximately 6.71-acre project site is in close proximity to the State Route (SR) 17 and SR 85 interchange.

1-3

Construction-Related Impacts

Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State roadways requires a transportation permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, please visit Caltrans Transportation Permits ([link](#)).

"Provide a safe and reliable transportation network that serves all people and respects the environment."



Letter 1 cont.

Erin Walters, Senior Planner
April 6, 2026
Page 2

**1-3
cont.**

Prior to construction, coordination may be required with Caltrans to develop a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to reduce construction traffic impacts to the State Transportation Network (STN).

1-4

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Luana Chen, Associate Transportation Planner, via LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov. For future early coordination opportunities or project referrals, please visit Caltrans LDR website ([link](#)) or contact LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



YUNSHENG LUO
Branch Chief, Local Development Review
Office of Regional and Community Planning

c: State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe and reliable transportation network that serves all people and respects the environment."



LETTER 1: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Response to Comment 1-1

The comment is introductory in nature and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 1-2

The comment consists of a summary of the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 1-3

The comment does not specifically address the adequacy of the IS/MND. The comment has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the project applicant and the decision-makers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 1-4

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.



Letter 2

From: Lisa Brancatelli <LBrancatelli@valleywater.org>
Sent: Monday, April 6, 2026 4:49 PM
To: Erin Walters <EWalters@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: RE: CEQA - Public Review Period NOI- IS/MND for 14789 Oka Road Project (VW16926)

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Hello Erin,

2-1

Valley Water staff have reviewed the Notice of Intent to Adopt an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the 14789 Oka Road Project in Los Gatos. Based on our initial review, we have the following comments:

2-2

1. Mitigation Measure (b, c) on page 37 indicates that the project site is located more than 25 feet from Los Gatos Creek, meaning it would not negatively impact the creek or its associated riparian corridor and would align with the Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams adopted by the Town. However, efforts should be made to preserve the existing riparian vegetation or enhance the area by planting vegetation that is suitable for the riparian corridor. It is important to avoid hardscape and other active uses that could harm the creek and its riparian habitat. Setbacks to the creek should be measured from the top of bank or the edge of the riparian corridor, whichever distance is greater, and should be based on a biological assessment of the site.

2-3

2. Mitigation Measure (civ) on page 67. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) 06085C0239H, effective May 18, 2009, the project site is located in Zone X (shaded), an area with a 0.2% annual chance flood hazard. The document should be revised to include the FEMA zone description.

2-4

3. Mitigation Measure (d) on page 69, the IS/MND should also note that the entire project site is also subject to dam inundation from the James J. Lenihan Dam on Lexington Reservoir.

2-5

4. Valley Water records do not show any wells on the project site; however, it is always possible that a well exists that is not in Valley Water records. Abandoned or unused wells can serve as vertical conduits for contaminants to pollute groundwater. To avoid impacts to groundwater quality, any wells found on-site that will not be used must be properly destroyed in accordance with Ordinance 90-1, which requires issuance of a well destruction permit. Property owners or their representatives



Letter 2 cont.

- 2-5 cont.** should call the Wells and Water Measurement Unit at (408) 630-2660 for more information on well permits and registration for well destruction.
- 2-6** 5. Los Gatos Creek runs along the western property line, and Valley Water has an easement for the areas directly adjacent to the project site. Valley Water does not have any right-of-way or facilities within the project boundary; therefore, in accordance with Valley Water’s Water Resources Protection Ordinance, a Valley Water encroachment permit is not necessary for this project.
- However, please note that if the project boundaries change, or if work is proposed within Valley Water’s easement, or if there could be an impact on Valley Water facilities, including the Los Gatos Creek, a Valley Water encroachment permit will be required before construction can begin.
- 2-7** We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the IS/MND and look forward to reviewing any subsequent documents as they become available. If you have any questions, you may contact me at (408) 630-2479, or by e-mail at LBrancatelli@valleywater.org. Please reference District File No. 16926 on future correspondence regarding this project.

Thank you,

LISA BRANCATELLI
ASSOCIATE ENGINEER (CIVIL)

Community Projects Review Unit
lbrancatelli@valleywater.org
Tel. (408) 630-2479 / Cell. (408) 691-1247
CPRU Hotline: (408) 630-2650



SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118
www.valleywater.org

Clean Water · Healthy Environment · Flood Protection



LETTER 2: SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

Response to Comment 2-1

The comment is introductory and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 2-2

The reference to “Mitigation Measure (b, c)” included within the comment letter is incorrect. Rather, the comment is referring to the specific CEQA analysis section included within the IS/MND, not the mitigation measures included within the document.

With regard to stream setbacks, the Town relies on the Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams, developed by the Santa Clara Water Resources Collaborative. According to Section II.B.1, Bank Stability for Structures Built Near Streams, of the Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams, an offset of at least 20 feet from the top of the bank or property line is required for all new development. As shown on Figure 5, Proposed Utility Plan (1 of 2), on page 14 of the IS/MND, the proposed project would implement a 20-foot setback measured from the top of the bank, and thus, would comply with the standards provided in the Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams. An existing maintenance access road and levee are located between the top of the bank and the property line, which would remain with the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project would not impact Los Gatos Creek or its associated riparian corridor.

As the project would not adversely affect riparian habitat associated with Los Gatos Creek, there is no nexus to require the applicant to plant additional riparian vegetation.

Response to Comment 2-3

The reference to “Mitigation Measure (civ)” included within the comment letter is incorrect. Rather, the comment is referring to the specific CEQA analysis section included within the IS/MND, not the mitigation measures included within the document.

Based on the comment, page 67 of the IS/MND is hereby revised to include the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) zone description for the project site:

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) number 06085C0239H, effective May 18, 2009, the project site is located adjacent to a special flood hazard area (SFHA) associated with Los Gatos Creek. However, as shown in Figure 10, the entirety of the project site is located within an area classified as Zone X, an area with a 0.2 percent annual chance flood hazard. Zone X, ~~which~~ is not considered an SFHA.

Response to Comment 2-4

The reference to “Mitigation Measure (d)” included within the comment letter is incorrect. Rather, the comment is referring to the specific CEQA analysis section included within the IS/MND, not the mitigation measures included within the document.

Page 69 of the IS/MND is hereby revised to include additional information regarding potential dam inundation from the James J. Lenihan Dam on Lexington Reservoir:



The nearest reservoir is the Vasona Reservoir, located approximately 0.54-mile south of the site. In addition, the Lexington Reservoir and Lenihan Dam are located approximately 3.93 miles south of the site. The project site is located within the dam failure inundation area associated with the Vasona Reservoir, as well as the James J. Lenihan Dam on Lexington Reservoir. The dams in Santa Clara County are managed by the SCVWD. The dams are continuously monitored and regularly inspected, as well as inspected immediately following significant earthquakes. To date, the SCVWD has not identified any issues with the Vasona Reservoir dam or the James J. Lenihan Dam on Lexington Reservoir during inspections.

Response to Comment 2-5

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for the proposed project by AEI Consultants (see Appendix F to the IS/MND) states that existing wells were not identified on or near the project site. Thus, impacts related to wells are not anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project. Should an unanticipated well be discovered during construction, the well would be abandoned in accordance with Ordinance 90-1.

Response to Comment 2-6

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and has been noted for the record. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 2-7

The comment is conclusory and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.



Letter 3

From: Mario Blaum [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2026 7:14 PM
To: Erin Walters <EWalters@losgatosca.gov>
Cc: Rob Moore <RMoore@losgatosca.gov>; Maria Ristow <MRistow@losgatosca.gov>;
Mary Badame <MBadame@losgatosca.gov>; Matthew Hudes <MHudes@losgatosca.gov>;
Rob Rennie <RRennie@losgatosca.gov>; Town Manager <Manager@losgatosca.gov>;
Wendy Wood <WWood@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Project at 14389 Oka Road

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

3-1

Dear Erin: I want to briefly comment on the project at 14389 Oka Road, whose CEQA was recently mailed to us.

3-2

It is clear that new housing is desperately needed, and I understand the State issuing the so-called Builder's Remedy that overcomes local regulations and zoning. However, if public safety is compromised by a project, such a project authorization can (and I would add, should) be denied by the local authorities. I argue that this project, which contemplates the construction of 138 townhome units, clearly qualifies as unsafe. Actually, we had this discussion some 13 years ago (before the time of Builder's Remedy), and the Los Gatos Council at that time concurred with the neighbors and decided not to change the single-home zoning for the area. In the years since, the problems did not subside, but did actually get worse.

3-3

Oka Road is the single exit for the neighborhood. In case of emergency, there is no other way out (think about Paradise). We have several examples of this happening. Now, without any new construction at all, occasionally we get trapped in our houses. If there is a large event at the JCC, it takes a lot of time to get into Lark Av. Cars occasionally block Oka Road

3-4

when they pick up children at the school in the JCC. We had two bomb alarms (fortunately fake) that closed the road for hours. Every now and then, a car from above in 85 lands into Oka Road (in one case with tragic consequences). We have several residents in the

3-5

neighborhood that are disabled and may need emergency vehicles. Certainly, adding 138 units will not improve this situation when we need to get out. What would happen if there were a propagating fire? Climate change makes this possibility more likely in the future. Sparks can propagate fires for miles (think about Pacific Palisades and Altadena). Nobody could give us a satisfactory answer on what to do if such a scenario occurs.



Letter 3 cont.

3-6

The Council is obligated to protect our lives as well as the ones of the people that will inhabit the 138 units planned. For the given reasons, the project should be either rejected or sized down significantly. Thanks for your attention.

Sincerely,

Mario Blaum

Los Gatos, CA 95032

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]



LETTER 3: MARIO BLAUM

Response to Comment 3-1

The comment is introductory and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 3-2

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and the commenter does not provide any substantial evidence demonstrating why the project is “unsafe”.

Response to Comment 3-3

The comment references Paradise in the context of Oka Road being the single exit for the neighborhood. Thus, the concern would appear to be focused on wildfire. As discussed on page 100 of the IS/MND, according to the maps prepared as part of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) Fire and Resource Assessment Program, the project is not located within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) nor within a Very High or High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. According to CAL FIRE Mapping, the nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone is located approximately 1.2 miles southeast, across Highway 17, with substantial intervening urban development. The California Attorney General’s *Best Practices for Analyzing and Mitigating Wildfire Impacts of Development Projects Under the California Environmental Quality Act* appears to define high-risk areas as those being with an SRA or lands classified as High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Thus, based on the above, the project site is not located within a high-risk area for wildfire.

While the project could increase the amount of time for the limited residents north of the project site to evacuate in the event of an emergency, there is no substantial evidence to suggest that this could increase the risk to community safety given that the project is not located in a high wildfire risk area and the nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone is located approximately 1.2 miles away. Furthermore, unlike some rural areas where a relatively long single road provides the only egress/ingress to a high-risk area (e.g., Paradise), Lark Avenue is less than 1,000 feet to the south of the project site, which provides direct access to Highway 17 and other key local routes such as Winchester Boulevard and Los Gatos Boulevard.

Response to Comment 3-4

Please see Response to Comment 3-3.

Response to Comment 3-5

Please see Response to Comment 3-3.

Response to Comment 3-6

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and has been noted for the record. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.



Letter 4

From: Carolyn Drozdiak [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 12:57 PM
To: Erin Walters <EWalters@losgatosca.gov>; BONNIE VIEW PARK [REDACTED]; Jim Drozdiak [REDACTED]; Gerasimova, Lana [REDACTED]; Rob Moore <RMoore@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Oka Road 138 unit project

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

- 4-1 Please be sure the drive through is one-way & goes counter-clockwise into the new development on Oka Road.
- I.e., the ingress is next to the JCC parking lot and the egress is next to the Bonnie View Park.
- This will prevent many potential traffic problems –
- 4-2 Currently the traffic congestion potential at the juncture of LGSRC and Bonnie View Park as both residents and LGSRC club members enter the club and exit the park in the morning is alleviated by them going in a different direction in the early morning.
- Later in the afternoon, (end of workday), the traffic heading home to both Mozart and Bonnie View and the LGSRC is plenty for that small intersection to handle. By having the new residents (of the new development) turn into their homes BEFORE that congested intersection, many problems and frustrations will be avoided!!
- 4-3 I have written about this in my letters to you and the committee last year. I have also spoken directly to Rob Mor about it and reminded him about it recently. Thanks for your consideration.

Carolyn Drozdiak
[REDACTED]



LETTER 4: CAROLYN DROZDIK (1 OF 2)

Response to Comment 4-1

The commenter's recommendation appears to be related to concerns about increased congestion on Oka Road as a result of the project. Please see Response to Comment 4-2.

Response to Comment 4-2

Potential impacts related to transportation are discussed under Section XVII, Transportation, of the IS/MND. As discussed therein, traditionally, lead agencies used level of service (LOS) to assess the significance of impacts related to transportation. LOS represents a qualitative description of the traffic operations experienced by the driver at an intersection or along a roadway segment, most commonly understood as congestion. However, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Natural Resources Agency promulgated CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 in late 2018, which became effective in early 2019. Subdivision (a) of that section provides that "[g]enerally, vehicle miles traveled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, concerns related to LOS are not required to be addressed in the IS/MND, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is now used, rather than LOS, to assess the significance of transportation impacts under CEQA. Therefore, the analysis included under Section XVII, Transportation, of the IS/MND focuses on VMT and not on the effects of the proposed project on traffic conditions or congestion along roadways in the project vicinity. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers are part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 4-3

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.



Letter 5

On Monday, March 23, 2026 at 09:51:23 PM PDT, Carolyn Drozdiak

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

- 5-1 Hi all,
Oops!
- 5-2 Somehow I said counter-clockwise in my earlier e-mail-- but I described a clockwise flow! sheesh! I meant clockwise!
- 5-2 To avoid a big traffic back-up at end of business days I believe, the ingress to the new Oka Road development would clearly be better at the south side (by the JCC). Otherwise, everyone wanting to get home to Mozart, OR Bonnie View, OR the new development (OR to a LGSRC work-out class or a kid swim team practice or tennis match after work) would all be queued up on little Oka Road going north from Lark--all heading to that one unofficial "intersection" where the three complexes have an entrance/exit.
- Just imagine the fun between 5 & 7pm!
- And that does not even account for the difficulty there will be by definition as people turn left out of the LGSRC club and are immediately confronted with cars turning left in front of them trying to enter the new Oka Road complex. I think it will be far safer to have the ingress to the new complex be on the south side (by the JCC).
- 5-3 That will also keep any headlights in the evening (from cars returning home after dark) away from the windows of [REDACTED] 🙌.
- 5-4 If the egress is along Bonnie View (north side), I do not think [REDACTED] will get much extra exhaust, as that is the same way cars exit Bonnie View in the morning now-anyway. There is
- 5-5 really no significant cueing up to turn right out of Bonnie View now, and the new driveway will be a pretty open "breezeway" from the drawings Lana just shared.
- 5-6 My biggest concern now (other than the big mess, noise & daily traffic disruption which a large, lengthy construction project next door will clearly cause) is a question of enough parking for the new unit owners and their visitors & roommates.
- Carolyn



LETTER 5: CAROLYN DROZDIK (2 OF 2)

Response to Comment 5-1

Please see Response to Comment 4-1.

Response to Comment 5-2

Please see Response to Comment 4-2.

Response to Comment 5-3

As discussed under Section I, Aesthetics, of the IS/MND, existing sources of light and glare in the vicinity of the site include headlights on cars and trucks travelling along Oka Road. Thus, any vehicle traffic associated with the proposed project would not be considered a new source of light and glare along Oka Road, nor would it be considered “substantial” (See Appendix G, Section I, Question ‘d’) in the context of the anticipated nighttime trips associated with the project. For example, even during winter, when the majority of project-related vehicle trips could be returning home in the PM peak hour when it is dark, only 47 vehicles are estimated to enter the site and 32 are estimated to exit the site (IS/MND, Appendix C, Table 3).

Response to Comment 5-4

As discussed under Section III, Air Quality, of the IS/MND, an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment was prepared for the proposed project, which concluded that the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria pollutants, such as exhaust, in excess of the Bay Area Air District’s (BAAD’s) applicable thresholds of significance. In addition, based on the BAAD’s screening criteria for localized CO emissions, the proposed project would not be expected to result in substantial levels of localized CO at surrounding intersections or generate localized concentrations of CO that would exceed standards or cause health hazards.

Response to Comment 5-5

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 5-6

It is unclear what “big mess” the commenter is referring to. Please see Response to Comment 4-2. In addition, as discussed under Section XIII, Noise, of the IS/MND, a Noise and Vibration Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by I&R (see Appendix K of the IS/MND), which determined that the proposed project is not anticipated to increase peak hour traffic volumes along Oka Road sufficient to significantly increase noise levels. In comparison to existing peak hour traffic volumes along Oka Road, the peak hour trips associated with the proposed project would result in a noise level increase of less than one decibel (dBA L_{dn}), compared to the three dBA L_{dn} threshold established by the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON). The three dBA L_{dn} threshold is the level at which a noise level increase becomes perceptible. Thus, operation of the proposed project would not generate a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of applicable noise standards.

The scope of an EIR is limited to a local agency’s evaluation of potentially significant environmental impacts of a project. (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21060.5; CEQA Guidelines Section 15360.) An analysis of parking impacts is not included within the IS/MND because such potential impacts are not considered to have effects on the environment. As noted on page 11 of the IS/MND, the proposed project would include a total of 396 parking spaces



throughout the site, which would include 20 guest spaces. Furthermore, the proposed project would include on-street parking along the Oka Road frontage.



Letter 6

From: Jim Drozdiak [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 9:56 AM
To: Rob Moore <RMoore@losgatosca.gov>; Carolyn Drozdiak [REDACTED]>;
Jim Drozdiak [REDACTED]>
Cc: Lana Gerasimova <[REDACTED]>; Erin Walters <EWalters@losgatosca.gov>;
BONNIE VIEW PARK [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Oka Road 138 unit project part 2

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Hi all,

As Carolyn states, our biggest concern now is parking. I noted this in my December 2024 input to the project team, and the issue remains. The current plan for guest parking is insufficient.

There are always cars parked on Oka Rd. next to the apartments across from the JCC. The situation will be even worse with the 138 unit project.

Also, on some spring and summer Saturdays with swim meets at the LG Swim & Racquet Club, cars swarm all over Oka Rd and beyond, making parking virtually impossible.

6-1

The best solution would be to replace the "mini-park" in the northwest area of the new development with more guest parking. I don't like removing a "green" area, but it seems to be the most realistic solution. (Another option would be to reduce the number of townhomes to make room for parking, but no doubt the developer would find that financially impractical.)

This won't completely solve the problem, but it will make things much better. The developer requested a Builder's Remedy waiver for guest parking requirements, but I think it's in the developer's best interests to make this change. Townhome owners will find this arrangement more beneficial in the long run.

Regards,

Jim Drozdiak

Bonnie View resident



LETTER 6: JIM DROZDIAK

Response to Comment 6-1

Please see Response to Comment 5-6.



Letter 7

From: Lana Gerasimova [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 4:45 PM
To: Erin Walters <EWalters@losgatosca.gov>
Cc: Carolyn Drozdiak <[REDACTED]>; BONNIE VIEW PARK
<[REDACTED]>; Jim Drozdiak <[REDACTED]>; Rob Moore
<RMoore@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: Oka Road 138 unit project

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

- Hi Carolyn,
- 7-1 Thank you very much for your idea and trying to keep us safe! I actually thought about the counter-clockwise idea earlier on too, but after looking at it more closely, I started to get concerned about the impact on the homes along Bonnie View.
- 7-2 With that setup, headlights from cars exiting would shine directly into those houses at night. For example, [REDACTED] home would be pretty exposed since it faces the internal driveway between the townhomes. I worry that could really affect sleep.
- 7-3 Also, having cars slow down and turn onto Oka right there would likely mean more noise and exhaust near [REDACTED] windows.
- 7-4 On another note, I've been working with the developer on the entrance layout, and Erik Hayden agreed to shift the road slightly so the sharp turn issue should be improved, which you know was a huge concern of mine. I'll attach couple of images below for you:) It may not be exact, but should be something close to that (hopefully).
- 7-5 With all that in mind, I'm hoping we can keep the current direction rather than switching it.
- Really appreciate you bringing this up though it's helpful to think through all angles, and I think we're all trying to get to the best outcome for everyone.

Sincerely,

Lana



Letter 7 cont.



7-6



Letter 7 cont.

7-6
cont.



LETTER 7: LANA GERASIMOVA

Response to Comment 7-1

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 7-2

Please see Response to Comment 5-3.

Response to Comment 7-3

Please see Responses to Comments 5-4 and 5-6.

Response to Comment 7-4

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 7-5

The comment is a conclusion statement and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 7-6

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.



Letter 8

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: DICK HENNING [REDACTED]

To: Ewalters@losgatoca.gov <ewalters@losgatoca.gov>

Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2026 at 01:11:32 PM PDT

Subject: 14789 Oka Road , 138 Townhomes.

8-1

Hello , My name is Richard Henning. First a bit about myself. I was a member of the development team who built 18 homes in 1986 through 1988 at the end of Mozart to include Mojonera Court and Mozart Court at the end. I have a B.S. degree in Urban and Regional Planning from U.C Davis , 1977, which led me to my work in residential development over 3 decades. We met strong opposition in taking out the "beloved" Los Gatos YMCA that had resided there for years prior. And the opposition from the entire neighborhood to single family new homes (many of which are 2 stories), 18 to be exact on normal sized lots of 9,000 to 16,000 square feet. The opposition also cited density in proximity to the "future" large freeway planned called Highway 85. The argument went on for years to come after the homes were done as to how to access the neighborhood with the new freeway going in and how cal-trans and the city would handle easy access in the case of personal emergencies or fire to the homes. Putting in access over the creek to Winchester or building an underpass or overpass of the freeway on Oka Road , or both. This was argued for a long time finally settling on the single access route down Oka Road exiting onto Lark Avenue, despite the many concerns of high traffic density and emergency access at the time. (yes traffic problems existed in 1990) . That is a brief history of the prior development and concerns at the time. I bought and retained a home that was to be the model home in 1988 at the corner of Mojonera and Mozart. Most of the homes have sold two or more times since then, and the older homes that were in the neighborhood were all rebuilt or extensively remodeled now. Fast forward to TODAY. I am one of the older people in the neighborhood and few that remember the ordeals from a "developers" point of view. I am now in my 70's and I am disabled and face multiple health issues and no long drive or have a car. I have a driver and also have medical transportation frequently . (multiple times a month). I have been evacuated by ambulance as well in the past.

8-2

I have watched on you-tube the various city council meetings , but have not gone in person due to obvious reasons. I am astonished at the pure numbers of high density townhomes on the parcel which, by the way, is about the same as the size of the parcel containing the 18 homes myself and my team, marketed in 1987-1988, under the name "Bel Canto" . I understand the outrage by many

8-3

of the people around here about the sheer increase in volume of traffic that will clog and bring to a standstill the already huge traffic problem at certain times of day on Oka and Lark Avenue. For

8-4

myself as a disabled senior I am already convinced that the city council and members or the planning commission have giving their full approval and have done their duty by listening to the residents and concerned citizens as they always do prior to these massive developments.



Letter 8 cont.

8-5

Since this development will impede my personal emergency evacuation route and need for medical access in and out of the neighborhood at the end of Oka Road I have had to take measures to personally mitigate the future issue. I have put my attorney on notice that I will have problems getting to medical care and ambulances will not be able to get through the traffic problem . I have also put family members and neighbors on notice that the traffic will prohibit me from getting medical attention in the future. I am also PUTTING YOU AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON NOTICE OF FUTURE PROBLEMS WITH ME GETTING OUT OF SINGLE ACCESS SMALL TWO LANE OKA ROAD. Which is extremely inadequate for this 138 townhome development and existing 170 approx homes at the end of Oka Road., and tennis club, and mobile home park, and J.C.C and apartments, etc. .

8-6

I would like to also bring to your attention that in the Town Of Moraga , CA., has been sued by a group calling themselves "Safe Moraga" over approval of a 66 unit development without first studying an inadequate emergency route and the impact to residents along a small Two Lane Road called Moraga Road , with ONLY ONE WAY OUT. The group of residents accused the town and I quote , " Putting their dead in the sand and ignoring the evacuation route " Doesn't this sound eerily familiar to the Oka Road situation ???

8-7

I would also like you to copy my email and send it to the city council and planning commission members as my input and future emergency plans. I have problems with my hands in doing so physically, thank you.

And to assure that you read this correspondence and did not just file it with the other NIMBY letters you receive or in your spam folder , could you please call me at [REDACTED] to discuss further.

I look forward to talking to you soon.

Sincerely

Richard Henning

[REDACTED]



LETTER 8: RICHARD HENNING

Response to Comment 8-1

The comment is introductory and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 8-2

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 8-3

Please see Response to Comment 4-2.

Response to Comment 8-4

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 8-5

Please see Response to Comment 3-3. There is no substantial evidence to suggest that the project would impede emergency medical response vehicles from being able to access the commenter's home at the end of Oka Lane. If averaged over a 24-hour period, the project would only contribute an estimated 82 trips per hour to Oka Road (in reality a greater proportion of trips would occur during the AM and PM peak hours). Oka Road can accommodate this relatively modest increase in trips without disrupting the ability for emergency responders to adequately access residents along Oka Road.

Response to Comment 8-6

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. Please see Response to Comment 3-3.

Response to Comment 8-7

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and has been noted for the record. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.



Letter 9

From: Diana Schnabel <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 6, 2026 4:15 PM
To: Erin Walters <EWalters@losgatosca.gov>
Cc: Len Connolly <[REDACTED]>
Subject: CEQA PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: 14789 Oka Road Written Comments

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

- Erin,
- 9-1 Thank you for taking my phone call today. I appreciate your time.
Please see Jewish Silicon Valley's questions and comments for 14789 Oka Road (Architecture and Site Application S-24-052 & Subdivision Application M-24-017):
- Parking**
- 9-2
 - What are the Town rules during construction?
 - Are they going to be able to park on the street where there is currently no parking allowed?
- 9-3
 - Will there be an increase in police/private patrol? Who is going to pay for that if there is?
- 9-4
 - Our parking lot is private and is currently not going to be available for their use unless there is a written agreement.
 - This includes using our parking lot as a “turn around” for large construction vehicles.
 - It should NOT be happening unless there is prior written permission.
- 9-5
 - Enforcement of Oka Parking Lots - What does that look like?
 - Additional signage
 - Towing cars after hours
 - Towing construction vehicles during business hours
 - Apartments across the street
- Construction**
- 9-6
 - Contact Information



Letter 9 cont.

- 9-6 cont.**
- Providing a contact person for nights, weekends and business hours for emergencies.
- 9-7**
- When is the project scheduled to start?
 - Is the project 5 days a week, 6 days, 7 days?
- 9-8**
- How is this being communicated to the residents and business owners on Oka Road?
 - Will there be construction updates if there are delays, etc?
- 9-9**
- How long is the project slated to take, pending acts of God?
- 9-10**
- How do they plan on communicating with us regarding certain pieces of construction?
 - Electrical/Water/Power
 - If any utilities will be affected/turned off.
 - What is the notice requirement? Especially if school or camp is in session.
- 9-11**
- Are they open to feedback on the construction timeline?
 - When do we see an increase of construction vehicles?
- 9-12**
- How are they going to mitigate traffic control?
 - What are the plans in regards to traffic control during camp? During school?
- 9-13**
- Have they included CalTrans in their traffic studies?
- 9-14**
- Are they going to change/update the timing of the lights to fit the needs of the construction project?
 - Issues with the timing of traffic lights now. The light does not stay green long enough to circulate people off of Oka Road or Lark Ave (North and South).
- 9-15**
- How do they plan on mediating the “mess” during construction?
 - Construction Fencing
 - How tall will the fencing be during construction?
 - Will there be privacy screening to help with the dust control?



Letter 9 cont.

- 9-15 cont.**
- What percentage will it be? 90%? 95%
- 9-16**
- Garbage
 - Making sure garbage from the construction site is maintained and disposed of properly, so it does not blow into our playgrounds/property.
- 9-17**
- Hazardous Materials
 - Making sure hazardous materials from the construction site are maintained and disposed of properly.
- 9-18**
- Street Sweeping
 - During construction & Post construction
 - Materials on the main street. How will this be maintained and cleaned daily? Weekly?
 - I.e. nails, etc...
 - Dust/dirt when they break ground and during the entire construction process.
 - Coming into the play yards when the children are outside.
 - How do they plan to mitigate the amount of dust/dirt, as to not impact the current playground
 - cleaning schedule?
 - Impact on the JCC Pool.
 - How do they plan to mitigate the amount of dust/dirt, as to not impact the current pool cleaning schedule?
 - We request that builders cover any additional pool and deck cleaning due to the construction.
- 9-19**
- 9-20**
- Noise
 - Impacting preschool/nap time & Yavneh/testing, etc...
 - Wildlife
- 9-21**
- With the disruption of natural habitats, how do they plan on mitigating the migration of wildlife to our building?



Letter 9 cont.

9-21 cont.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I.e. rodents, insects, snakes, birds, etc...<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Concern that the first place the wildlife would find refuge would be the preschool classrooms, playgrounds, pool office, pool locker rooms, pool deck and pump house.
9-22	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Traffic<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Need confirmation that the roads▪ WILL NOT close at any point of time during construction during our business hours.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Access for emergency vehicles, etc
9-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Bike Lanes<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the safety measures that will be put in place for cyclists and pedestrians during construction?
9-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What signage will be posted to make sure construction vehicles do not enter the JCC Parking Lot?
9-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Security<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Construction Site<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How will the construction site be monitored after-hours?<ul style="list-style-type: none">• With materials being stored on-site, we are concerned about the increase in vandalism and theft. (Especially after being a victim of theft a year or so ago).▪ Will there be cameras installed?<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If so, will they be pointed at our building? Will they have sightlines into classrooms?• How are they being monitored? Is it recorded to the cloud?
9-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ DOJ's<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Are the workers who will be next door background checked or are there DOJ's on all of those that are in close proximity to a school?
9-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Noise Ordinances



Letter 9 cont.

- 9-27 cont.
- What are the projected working hours?
 - How will that impact businesses that have private events?
 - I.e. Bar/Bat Mitzvahs, Wedding Receptions, etc...
- 9-28
- Smoking vs Non-smoking Campus
 - Will smoking be allowed next to a school?
 - How will they monitor their staff smoking in front of our building, etc...?
- 9-29
- Sightlines
 - Building height exceeds maximum allowable 30ft.
 - Assuming builders remedy on this, and if so, what can be done with sightlines into classrooms and playgrounds?
- 9-30
- Town Infrastructure
 - Wear and tear on the streets
 - Will the street be repaved when the project is complete?
- 9-31
- We expect, as good neighbors, that the builders and developer will appropriately mitigate all the significant environmental impacts created by the project. All notices or communications regarding the project, including but not limited to any and all hearings, should be directed to:
- Diana Schnabel-Arevalo
Chief Operating Officer
[REDACTED]
- Len Connolly
Senior Director of Security & Facilities
[REDACTED]
- If you have any questions, please let me know.
Thank you,



Letter 9 cont.

Diana

Diana Schnabel-Arevalo
Chief Operating Officer
Jewish Silicon Valley
14855 Oka Road, Ste. 201
Los Gatos, CA 95032

www.jvalley.org

Join us in making a difference—[donate](#) to our annual campaign today!

9-31
cont.



This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose the message or any information contained in the message to anyone. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. If you are the intended recipient, please be advised that the content of this message is subject to access, review and disclosure by the sender's e-mail administrators.

LETTER 9: DIANA SCHNABEL

Response to Comment 9-1

The comment is introductory and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 9-2

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. Please see Response to Comment 5-6.

Response to Comment 9-3

As discussed under Section XV, Public Services, of the IS/MND, police protection services would be provided to the site by the Los Gatos-Monte Sereno Police Department. As noted therein, buildout of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities. The commenter's question about increased police/private patrol is beyond the scope of CEQA, as CEQA is focused on the project's potential physical effects on the environment (e.g., in the context of law enforcement, this could involve the construction of a new police station), rather than the potential needs for additional law enforcement services.

Response to Comment 9-4

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. Please see Response to Comment 5-6.

Response to Comment 9-5

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. Please see Response to Comment 5-6.

Response to Comment 9-6

As discussed under Section III, Air Quality, of the IS/MND, all projects within the district's jurisdiction are required to implement Basic Construction Mitigation Measures (BCMMs). In accordance with BAAD BCMM requirements, the proposed project would be required to post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. In addition, the proposed project would be subject to Mitigation Measure XIII-2, which requires the designation of a Disturbance Coordinator who shall be responsible for registering and investigating claims of excessive vibration. The contact information of the coordinator shall be clearly posted on the construction site.

Response to Comment 9-7

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. A construction schedule has not been provided at the time of this response. As discussed under Section XIII, Noise, of the IS/MND, pursuant to Section 16.20.035 of the Town's Municipal Code, construction activities would be limited to between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM weekdays, and 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM Saturdays. Construction would not be permitted on Sundays or holidays.

Response to Comment 9-8

Please see Response to Comment 9-7.



The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and has been noted for the record. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 9-9

As discussed under Section III, Air Quality, of the IS/MND, construction of the proposed project is anticipated to take place over approximately 15 months.

Response to Comment 9-10

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of the consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 9-11

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 9-12

Section XVII, Transportation, of Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines does not specifically require evaluation of short-term increases in traffic due to construction. Notwithstanding, the Town's standard conditions of approval require that the applicant submit a Temporary Traffic Control Plan (TCCP) for its review and approval prior to commencement of construction activities. The TCCP shall be inclusive of all modes of travel for any lane or sidewalk closures. Special provisions such as limitations on working hours, protective enclosures, or other means to facilitate public access in a safe manner may be required.

Response to Comment 9-13

The Transportation Analysis prepared for the proposed project by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (see Appendix C to the IS/MND) was routed to Caltrans through the State Clearinghouse as an Appendix to the IS/MND. Please see responses to Caltrans' comment letter on the IS/MND herein as Letter 1.

Response to Comment 9-14

Please see Response to Comment 4-2.

Response to Comment 9-15

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. In addition, as discussed on page 31 of the IS/MND, all projects under the jurisdiction of BAAD are required to implement the BAAD's BCMs. The BCMs would act to reduce construction-related dust by ensuring that haul trucks with loose material are covered, reducing vehicle dirt track-out, and limiting vehicle speeds within the improvement area, among other methods, which would ensure that construction of the proposed project does not result in substantial emissions of dust.

Response to Comment 9-16

In the context of solid waste, CEQA (Appendix G, Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems) asks whether the proposed project would 1) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or 2) Comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to managing solid waste and recycling. Temporary trash during the



construction period is beyond the scope of CEQA, and clearly, would not exceed the capacity of local solid waste infrastructure.

The commenter's concern will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of the consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 9-17

As discussed under Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the IS/MND, the project contractor would be required to comply with all California Health and Safety Codes regulating the handling, storage, and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials during construction activities.

Response to Comment 9-18

As discussed under Section III, Air Quality, of the IS/MND, the proposed project would be required to comply with Basic Construction Mitigation Measures (BCMMs) established by BAAD. Such measures would include, but not be limited to, the removal of all visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day, as well as watering all exposed surfaces two times per day.

Response to Comment 9-19

Please see Responses to Comments 9-15 and 9-18.

Response to Comment 9-20

As discussed under Section XIII, Noise, of the IS/MND, the Jewish Community Center, located 90 feet from the project site, is not anticipated to be significantly impacted by project construction-related noise. Nonetheless, the proposed project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure XIII-1, implementation of which would require the project contractor to establish noise-reduction measures to further reduce construction-related noise. Such measures would include the adequate muffling of stationary noise-generating equipment (with enclosures where feasible and appropriate), as well as limiting unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines. In addition, the Town has made the following staff-initiated revision to Mitigation Measure XIII-1, requiring a temporary noise barrier along the southern property line, as well as the northern property line:

XIII-1 Prior to approval of grading permits, the following criteria shall be established and noted on grading plans, subject to review and approval by the Town:

- *Ensure that construction activities are limited to the hours of 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and between the hours of 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction shall not be permitted on Sundays or holidays;*
- *At Temporary eight-foot noise barriers shall be constructed along the north and south property lines of the project site to shield adjacent sensitive receptors and residential land uses from ground-level construction equipment and activities. The noise barriers shall be solid over the face and at the base of the barrier to provide a five dBA noise reduction;*
- *Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment;*
- *Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be strictly prohibited;*



- *Locate stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors or portable power generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors as feasible. If the equipment must be located near receptors, adequate muffling (with enclosures where feasible and appropriate) shall be used to reduce noise levels at the adjacent sensitive receptors. Any enclosure openings or venting shall face away from sensitive receptors;*
- *Construction staging areas shall be established at locations that would create the greatest distance between the construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction;*
- *Locate material stockpiles, as well as maintenance/equipment staging and parking areas, as far as feasible from residential receptors;*
- *Control noise from construction workers' radios to a point where radio noise is not audible at existing residences bordering the project site; and*
- *Designate a disturbance coordinator responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler, etc.) and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include the number in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.*

Proof of compliance with the above measures shall be submitted to the Town of Los Gatos Building Department for review.

Compliance with Mitigation Measure XIII-1 would ensure that noise associated with the proposed project's construction equipment and activities would not result in any impacts to the Jewish Community Center. Please also see Response to Comment 5-6.

Response to Comment 9-21

As discussed under Section IV, Biological Resources, the project site is not located within a regional movement corridor or landscape linkage. Wildlife species may use Los Gatos Creek and the associated riparian corridor for movement through the area. An existing fence is located along the project site's western boundary, inhibiting wildlife species from using the site for movement. In addition, given that Los Gatos Creek and the associated riparian corridor are located to the west of the site, and agricultural lands are located to the east, any wildlife on the project site would most likely migrate to such natural lands rather than the developed areas located in the project vicinity. Furthermore, CEQA does not require an analysis of potential impacts to non-special-status species. As discussed under Section IV, Biological Resources, the proposed project would include relevant mitigation measures relating to the protection of special-status species. The IS/MND concluded that implementation of the provided mitigation measures would reduce any potential impacts to special-status species to a less-than-significant level.

Response to Comment 9-22

Please see Response to Comment 9-12.

Response to Comment 9-23

Please see Response to Comment 9-12.

Response to Comment 9-24

Please see Response to Comment 9-12.



Response to Comment 9-25

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. The commenter's concern will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of the consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 9-26

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. The commenter's concern will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of the consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 9-27

Please see Responses to Comments 9-7 and 9-20.

Response to Comment 9-28

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. The commenter's concern will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of the consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Comment 9-29

The comment appears to pertain to concerns about infringement of JCC's privacy due to the project's building heights. This concern is beyond the scope of CEQA and has been forwarded to the decision-makers for their consideration.

Response to Comment 9-30

The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. In addition, the comment does not provide substantial evidence supporting why the proposed project would cause significant wear and tear such as to warrant repaving of the roadways.

Response to Comment 9-31

The comment is a conclusion statement and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.



*This Page
Intentionally
Left Blank*