

Abello, Emmanuel

Attachments: CGF Comment Ltr_AgendaItem8.pdf

From: Julie Hutcheson [<mailto:julie@greenfoothills.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 3:57 PM

To: Ash Kalra <ash.kalra@sanjoseca.gov>; Linda Lezotte <board@valleywater.org>; shall@openspaceauthority.org;
Yeager, Ken <Ken.Yeager@bos.sccgov.org>; Wasserman, Mike <Mike.Wasserman@bos.sccgov.org>; Susan Vickland
Wilson <susan@svwilsonlaw.com>; taramilius@gmail.com

Cc: Palacherla, Neelima <Neelima.Palacherla@ceo.sccgov.org>; Kelly, Kieran <kieran.kelly@BOS.SCCGOV.ORG>; Velasco,
Roland <Roland.Velasco@bos.sccgov.org>; Shih, Stacie <stacie.shih@sanjoseca.gov>; ykishimoto@openspace.org; Terry
Trumbull <terryt1011@aol.com>; District3@sanjoseca.gov; Chavez, Cindy <Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org>; Rob Rennie
<RRennie@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: Agenda Item 8: CGF Comment Ltr

Dear LAFCO Commissioners,

Attached please find the Committee for Green Foothills' comment letter regarding Agenda Item 8 - the request for reconsideration of LAFCO's action to deny the City of Morgan Hill's USA Amendment 2015.

Thank you,
Julie

Julie Hutcheson
Legislative Advocate, [Committee for Green Foothills](#)
(650) 968-7243 x339
[Facebook](#) ● [Twitter](#)

***Our Mission** is to protect the open spaces, farmlands, and natural resources of San Mateo and Santa Clara counties through advocacy, education, and grassroots action.*



**COMMITTEE FOR
GREEN FOOTHILLS**

Tuesday, May 31, 2016

LAFCO Commissioners
Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County
70 West Hedding Street, 8th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110

**RE: REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MARCH 11, 2016 LAFCO ACTION TO DENY CITY
OF MORGAN HILL URBAN SERVICE AREA AMENDMENT 2015**

Dear Commissioners,

Committee for Green Foothills (CGF) concurs with staff's conclusion to deny the above noted request for reconsideration. We respectfully urge you to support staff's recommendation in this matter. As both the staff report and general counsel memoranda clearly elucidate, no new or different facts that could not have been previously presented have been brought forth to merit LAFCO reconsideration.

As CGF and other organizations have maintained, the City's USA Amendment 2015, both whole and in part, has substantial shortcomings which are inconsistent with LAFCO policies as well as countywide urban growth management policies, portions of the South County Joint Area Plan, and the County's Land Use and Resource Conservation policies related to agricultural preservation. Furthermore, the reconsideration request does not fit well with the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation Strategy process currently being led by the County.

Finally, there were substantial concerns with the CEQA documentation which caused LAFCO, the County, and the Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority, to request that the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) not be certified. To that point, Attachment G of the staff report points out that the High School Only Alternative contained in the EIR does not analyze the impact of including the 3 parcels (22 acres) that would allow for contiguity with the current Urban Service Area (USA).

Therefore, should the Commission grant a reconsideration hearing, we urge you not to approve the proposal to include 6 parcels totaling approximately 60 acres into Morgan Hill's USA.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Julie Hutcheson". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "J" and a cursive "Hutcheson".

Julie Hutcheson
Legislative Advocate

Abello, Emmanuel

From: Andrew Crabtree <Andrew.Crabtree@morganhill.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 3:56 PM
To: Palacherla, Neelima; Abello, Emmanuel
Cc: Andy Pashby; Bart Hechtman ; Steve Rymer
Subject: LAFCO Reconsideration - clarification of CEQA Adequacy
Attachments: South County Catholic High School Letter.pdf

Neelima,

I'm aware that the Catholic Diocese of San Jose has requested reconsideration of the LAFCO action on the City of Morgan Hill 2025 USA expansion request and that the reconsideration is conditionally scheduled for this Wednesday. After receiving your staff report on Friday for tomorrow's LAFCO meeting, I asked our CEQA consultant to review your concerns about the ability under CEQA to consider one of the project alternatives identified in the project EIR. The CEQA consultant has provided the attached letter in response to my request, and has concluded that it is possible for LAFCO to take action on the alternative in compliance with CEQA requirements based upon the "high school only" alternative included within the City's EIR.

Please consider this new information and provide it to the LAFCO Commissioners prior to their meeting tomorrow.

Thank you,

Andrew

May 31, 2016

Andrew Crabtree
City of Morgan Hill
Community Development Department
17575 Peak Avenue
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Subject: South County Catholic High School—Santa Clara County LAFCO Staff Report

Dear Andrew:

This letter is to address statements made in the Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Staff Report for the June 1, 2016 meeting regarding the South County Catholic High School.

Background

In November 2014, the Morgan Hill City Council certified the Citywide Agriculture Preservation Program and Southeast Quadrant (SEQ) Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)—State Clearinghouse No. 2010102010. This EIR provided project-level California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) coverage for the development of a 1,600-student Catholic high school on 38 acres at the intersection of Tennant Avenue/Murphy Avenue. The EIR evaluated the high school's environmental impacts in the following topical sections: aesthetics, light, and glare; air quality and greenhouse gas emissions; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils, and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; noise; population and housing; public services and recreation; transportation; and utility systems.

Additionally, the EIR evaluated a "High School Only Alternative," in which the high school was evaluated independently of the balance of the SEQ project. As indicated on Draft EIR pages 5-19 and 5-20, the "High School Only Alternative" contemplated annexation and boundary adjustments associated with the 38-acre high school site plus three contiguous properties encompassing 22 acres, for a total of 60 acres.¹ This alternative assumed that only development of the high school would be pursued; the three contiguous properties would maintain their existing land use activities because the proposed boundary adjustments would not confer any development rights that would allow new construction to occur.

¹ The three properties are located between the high school property and the existing Morgan Hill city limits and, therefore, are proposed to be annexed with the high school site in the interests of creating logical and orderly jurisdictional boundaries.



UNITED STATES

Irvine
250 Commerce, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92602

Los Angeles
11755 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1660
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Bay Area
1350 Treat Boulevard, Suite 380
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Central Valley
7265 N First Street, Suite 101
Fresno, CA 93720

Inland Empire
650 E. Hospitality Lane, Suite 125
San Bernardino, CA 92408

Sacramento
180 Promenade Circle, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95834

Connecticut
1175 Post Road E
Westport, CT 06880

EUROPE

United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0) 845.165.6245
Fax: +44 (0) 20.3070.0890
Future Business Centre
Kings Hedges Rd.
Cambridge CB4 2HY
United Kingdom

AUSTRALIA

New South Wales
Tel: +61 (02) 9418.7822
Fax: +61 (02) 9418.7833
13-15 Smith Street
Chatswood, NSW 2067
Australia

AFRICA

Kenya
Tel: +254-737-433-621
ADEC Kenya Services EPZ Ltd.
Nairobi, Kenya

ASIA

Philippines
Tel: +63 (2) 775.0632
Fax: +63 (2) 775.0632 local 8050
26th Floor, Philippine AXA Life Centre,
Sen. Gil Puyat Avenue,
Makati City, Metro Manila

Malaysia

Tel: +603 74902112
Fax: +603 79606977
15-7, Block A, Jaya ONE
72A Jalan Universiti
46200 Petaling Jaya
Selangor, Malaysia

LAFCO staff and legal counsel submitted a letter to the City of Morgan Hill, dated February 18, 2014 that provided written comments on the Draft EIR. While the letter offered extensive commentary on the proposed SEQ boundary adjustments, General Plan consistency, agricultural lands, and LAFCO policy consistency, it was silent on the issues of the adequacy of the project-level CEQA coverage for the high school or the “High School Only Alternative.” The EIR was never legally challenged by a responsible agency (or third party) and, therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(e) it is presumed to be legally adequate for the purposes of LAFCO consideration.

On March 11, 2016, Santa Clara County LAFCO considered the proposed boundary adjustments contemplated by the EIR, including those that would have enabled development of the high school. Although LAFCO ultimately voted to deny the adjustments, several Commissioners indicated that they were supportive of the high school application. Moreover, several members expressed confusion regarding the level of CEQA coverage provided for the high school in the EIR. Subsequently, the applicant requested that LAFCO reconsider the high school application because of the apparent confusion about the level of CEQA review, which is scheduled to occur on June 1, 2016. As such, we have prepared this letter to clarify the level of CEQA coverage provided by the EIR.

Summary of LAFCO Claims

LAFCO’s legal counsel contends in a May 16, 2016 memorandum² that “the EIR does not evaluate the impact of amending the City’s [Urban Service Area] by 60 acres to accommodate the high school site plus the approximately 22 acres of neighboring properties needed to be included in order to create a contiguous boundary.” Legal counsel asserts that LAFCO “cannot rely on the findings of EIR as to the impacts of developing the High School Only Alternative, as those findings do not address the impacts of approving the USA expansion by 60 acres.” LAFCO concludes that the Commission cannot fulfill its duties as a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15096.

Response

The “High School Only Alternative” disclosed and contemplated boundary adjustments for the 60-acre area that encompassed the high school site and adjoining properties. As previously noted, these boundary adjustments do not confer development rights to the three non-high school properties. As a practical matter, should these properties be annexed into the City of Morgan Hill, existing land use activities that occurred on these parcels under County jurisdiction would be “grandfathered in” as legal, non-conforming uses. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15145, the EIR appropriately did not engage in speculation about future development on these properties in the context of the High School Only Alternative.

Should any of the affected property owners elect to pursue more intense development or land use activities following annexation, they would be required to file an application to go through the City’s discretionary development review process. As part of this process, the application would be reviewed to

² May 16, 2016 Memorandum from Mala Subramanian and Sarah E. Owsowitz, Best, Best, & Krieger

determine the appropriate level of CEQA review. Until the property owners formally signal their intentions regarding the future use of their parcels, it would be improper to make any statements about this in the context of CEQA.

Moreover, CEQA Guidelines Section 15319(a) exempts annexations of existing facilities developed to the density of current zoning from CEQA review. The relevant language from Section 15319(a) is reproduced as follows:

Annexations to a city or special district of areas containing existing public or private structures developed to the density allowed by the current zoning or pre-zoning of either the gaining or losing governmental agency whichever is more restrictive, provided, however, that the extension of utility services to the existing facilities would have a capacity to serve only the existing facilities.

The three adjoining parcels are zoned A-20 (Exclusive Agriculture, 20 acre minimum) by the County of Santa Clara Zoning Atlas and support agricultural land and rural residential uses. Accordingly, existing development and land use activities on these parcels conform to the density allowed by the current zoning. As such, it appears that the annexation of these parcels would be exempt from CEQA review.

In summary, the “High School Only Alternative” fully disclosed the extent of the proposed boundary adjustments that are necessary to allow development of the proposed South County Catholic High School in accordance with CEQA principles. Furthermore, it appears that annexation of the three adjoining parcels is exempt from CEQA review, which renders any concern or objection about the adequacy of EIR’s evaluation of this topic to be moot. As such, we contend that LAFCO, acting as a responsible agency, has the legal basis to find that the EIR is adequate for the purposes of its discretionary approvals.

Conclusion

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like additional information about this project or EIR. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Grant Gruber".

Grant Gruber
Project Manager
FirstCarbon Solutions
1350 Treat Boulevard, Suite 380
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Abello, Emmanuel

From: PATRICIA SANDO [<mailto:patriciasando@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 2:05 PM
To: Yeager, Ken <Ken.Yeager@bos.sccgov.org>
Cc: Palacherla, Neelima <Neelima.Palacherla@ceo.sccgov.org>
Subject: RE: SEQ ANEXATION OF HIGH PROPERTY

In our previous email in support of the annexation of the south county site for the proposed high school we expressed our general support of the school. In this new appeal we will be specific. There are five reasons why this request for the annexation should receive your support.

- The Diocese of San Jose needs another high school in order to provide a Catholic secondary school education for many of the students graduating from local Catholic elementary schools who do not have an opportunity to attend the existing schools.
- The greatest need for an additional school is in the southern end of the Diocese (coincident with south Santa Clara County) where the population is growing at a rapid rate.
- Morgan is the logical location for a regional school. It is in the central portion of the area to be served and could pull students from both the north and the south rather than from either end all the way to the other extreme.
- There is no suitable site for the proposed school within the Morgan Hill.
- The Diocese owns the site proposed for the annexation. The site was previously selected for the second high school in the Morgan Hill Unified School District before the Sabrato Family made their generous gift to the district – the site of Sabrato High School north of the city of Morgan Hill.
-

Please support the annexation of the property into the city of Morgan Hill.

From: patriciasando@hotmail.com
To: ken.yeager@bos.sccgov.org
CC: neelima.palacherla@ceo.sccgov.org
Subject: SEQ Comment
Date: Tue, 8 Mar 2016 10:30:42 -0800

My husband and I have lived in this beautiful valley since 1986. We very much appreciate the efforts of many people to preserve as much agricultural look and feel of the area as possible. Having said that, we also are very much in favor of allowing a Catholic High School to be on the forty acres they have requested in the Murphy/Tennant area.

We recognize the dynamic tension between those who say “no development of any kind unless you grow strawberries” and those who say “let’s just build the hell out of it.” In general, we share the goal to preserve the status quo. But, we also recognize the need to think about the future.

That is why we have been active financial and emotional supporters of the proposed new Catholic School. Even though the forty acres would no longer produce hay, it would certainly develop young citizens who can contribute to the fabric of the community.

Thank you for your consideration of our support of the school.

Patricia Sando and Lowell Sando

Abello, Emmanuel

From: Eli Zigas <ezigas@spur.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 11:52 AM
To: TaraMilius@gmail.com; District2@sanjoseca.gov; Wasserman, Mike; Susan@svwilsonlaw.com; district3@openspaceauthority.org; board@valleywater.org; Yeager, Ken
Cc: Abello, Emmanuel; Palacherla, Neelima
Subject: SPUR comments re: reconsideration of Morgan Hill annexation request
Attachments: LAFCO_Letter_Reconsideration_Proposal_SPUR_May_31_16.pdf

Dear LAFCO Commissioners:

On behalf of SPUR, I am writing to express our support for LAFCO's earlier decision regarding various annexation proposals for Morgan Hill considered on March 11. At that meeting, LAFCO upheld its mandate to encourage cities throughout the county to concentrate growth within existing city boundaries. We encourage the commission to continue that policy direction by adopting the staff recommendation regarding the reconsideration before the commission at tomorrow's meeting.

A letter detailing our position is attached. If I can answer any questions or provide you with any additional information, please let me know. Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,
Eli

CC: Neelima Palacherla, Emmanuel Abello

--

Eli Zigas
Food and Agriculture Policy Director
SPUR • Ideas + Action for a Better City
415.644.4881
ezigas@spur.org

Join us this summer for the SPUR Member Parties!
[Reserve your spot today >>](#)

[SPUR](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Join](#) | [Get Newsletters](#)



SPUR

San Francisco | San Jose | Oakland

May 31, 2016

Local Agency Formation Commission
of Santa Clara County (LAFCO)
70 West Hedding Street
8th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

RE: Request for Reconsideration: Morgan Hill Urban Service Area Amendment 2015.

Dear LAFCO Commissioners:

On behalf of SPUR, I am writing to express our support for LAFCO's earlier decision regarding various annexation proposals for Morgan Hill considered on March 11.

At that meeting, LAFCO upheld its mandate to encourage cities throughout the county to concentrate growth within existing city boundaries. We encourage the commission to continue that policy direction by adopting the staff recommendation regarding the reconsideration proposal currently before the commission.

The planning process begun by the County Planning Department and Open Space Authority has the potential to provide a comprehensive framework for how to concentrate growth while preserving as much of the county's remaining farmland as possible. For that reason, we encourage to the commission to refrain from approving proposals that would expand city boundaries until the results of the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Policy Framework process can be considered.

Sincerely,

Eli Zigas
Food and Agriculture Policy Director

CC: Neelima Palacherla, LAFCO Executive Officer
Emmanuel Abello, LAFCO Clerk

Abello, Emmanuel

From: D. Muirhead <doug.muirhead@stanfordalumni.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 11:29 AM
To: Abello, Emmanuel
Subject: LAFCO Meeting June 01, 2016 Item #08, #09, #10 comments

Dear Local Agency Formation Commission,

Comments for the Public Record submitted by Doug Muirhead, a resident of Morgan Hill, for:
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
Meeting June 01, 2016

Item #08: Morgan Hill USA amendment for Private High School

Item #09: LAFCO FY 2017 budget add FTE

Item #10: relocate LAFCO office to charcot road Thank you for your consideration, Doug Muirhead, Morgan Hill

8. RECONSIDER MARCH 11, 2016 LAFCO ACTION TO DENY CITY OF MH USA AMENDMENT 2015

I am opposed to annexation of land into Morgan Hill for a Private High School.

With respect to CEQA Action 5: LAFCO must find that the project's benefits outweigh the reconsideration project's significant, unavoidable environmental impacts. LAFCO staff suggest the following overriding considerations if the Commission approves the reconsideration project:

- The reconsideration project provides an avenue to meet the educational needs of the community and support student population growth.
- The reconsideration project includes sports, recreation, and leisure uses that are intended to attract visitors to Morgan Hill and is in support of the Morgan Hill General Plan policy of promoting recreation and tourism opportunities.

If a private party wants to build a school in the City, they should acquire land in the City. Since they bought land in the County, they can deal with the County. The City, in their presentation to you for the SEQ USA, and again as a Council agenda item following the LAFCO decision, showed a progression of larger areas of land within City limits being eliminated from consideration.

However, the "unsuitability" of those lands was not an absolute but was based on the City's current preference for how that land is used and that comes from the City's value system.

We asked you to reject the SEQ USA in order to give us the opportunity to preserve and support agriculture. You are being asked to create new restrictions on farm land use by adding large numbers of school children to the neighborhood.

And the City gets their piece of the original application for tourism visitors that will also interfere with development of any framework for agricultural preservation and development.

I also see any new annexed land as just a new edge for the next expansion attempt by the City.

9. PROPOSED LAFCO BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

I was uncomfortable with the discussion at the last Commission meeting on whether LAFCO should add 0.5 FTE or 1.0 FTE and there was no data to support either choice. We know LAFCO staff work hard. We don't know how much

overtime was spent on the MH SEQ USA. We don't know what level of effort has been spent on other applications, consultations, etc. We don't know what projects are not attempted or are suspended because of lack of resources. Because the MH SEQ USA exceeded the deposit, MH received an itemized billing for the balance. So we know that detailed timekeeping is available.

I would like to see that timekeeping detail used to support the choice of an additional 0.5 FTE or 1.0 FTE. Note that an estimate of time required for various activities is available in the April 21, 2010 staff report for the Proposed LAFCO 2010 Fee Schedule Revision.

10. NOTICE FROM COUNTY TO relocate LAFCO office to charcot road

I am very disappointed in the County Executive for not applying Just Culture to our partners, in this case, LAFCO. The County Executive, while acknowledging the interdependence between LAFCO, other County departments, and County residents, indicated that LAFCO is not its priority, particularly in light of recent directives from the County Board of Supervisors concerning new programs and their associated office space needs. This space issue does not appear in the County budget document and was not discussed at the Budget workshops.

I also object to the abruptness of the directive from the Deputy Executive on May 13 to complete the move to Charcot Road by June 27.

But I am also disappointed that the LAFCO Executive Director did not inform us of the on-going discussion so that this forced eviction could be presented at the County Budget workshop.

We went through a similar situation last year, but without the final resolution being a move from Government Center. At that time, I made public comment to Finance and Government Operations Committee at their June 11 meeting. I will submit comments on the LAFCO business case and Just Culture's unjust treatment of partners for the Board budget approval item and again at FGOC. But this is too little too late.

Abello, Emmanuel

From: Charmel Perrier <charmels2626@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 28, 2016 4:05 PM
To: Palacherla, Neelima; Abello, Emmanuel
Subject: Morgan Hill -Proposed New Catholic High School

To whom all this may concern at LAFCO:

We are begging you to not go back on your decision of March 11th 2016, by allowing the farmland at Tennant and Murphy to be used for a private high school. Nothing has changed! This is still precious farmland that we cannot afford to it lose period! This plan was a bad one, when it was first presented many years ago. As you well know, if you open the door for this, many others will follow and the farmland is gone forever!

The City of Morgan Hill still has 100 years of open space left. There is no valid reason to use farmland for anything other than agriculture.

We hope LAFCO, can see what God himself has given us. Have they not seen farmland being sold out to developers in record numbers in this country? Where will we get our produce? The day will come, when we buy all our fruits, nuts, and vegetables, from outside the USA. There we will have little control over quality, cost or food safety. We must save our farmland at all costs!

We are in different times and need people who have a vision of the reality of our planets future. Morgan Hill already has several high schools. Do we really need another? The Southeast Quadrant has already given county land to both the Soccer Fields and the Aquatics Center. It's time the City of Morgan Hill looks into their own backyard. Our freeway and two lane country roads could not handle that amount of added traffic. Anyone who uses the 101 freeway, Tennant and Murphy will attest to that.

We are in a draught and while we have been getting some rain, we are a long way from ending the draught. Plus, now with Green House Gases on the rise, Goble

Warming will become an even bigger issue in the years to come.

We ask the question to the Diocese's and LAFCO, shouldn't we be using water for farming, instead of school sports fields? Please look into all the fact and do what is right for Morgan Hill. Agriculture needs to be saved now! The Diocese's plans may have worked 50 years ago, but the world has changed.

**Mel & Charlyn Perreir
Morgan Hill,CA**

Abello, Emmanuel

From: Julie Borina Driscoll <julieboridriscoll@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 29, 2016 4:21 AM
To: Abello, Emmanuel
Cc: jRosen@da.sccgov.org; jBoyarsky@da.sccgov.org; jjones@scscourt.org; san francisco@ic.fbi.gov; CA Oosterman John - FSA Davis; Cortese, Dave; Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Yeager, Ken; mark.hultgren@ca.usda.gov; Attorney Bruce Tichinin
Subject: Thank you for the Agenda and Minutes--Accuracy--LAFCO MEETING MINUTES

Dear Emmanuel,

Thank you for the Minutes of The LAFCO Meeting on March 11, 2016.

I would like you to please forward this to the Manager of whomever was responsible for the Minutes transcription for the LAFCO Meeting on March 11, 2016, please.

IMPORTANT POINTS OF CONSIDERATION, PLEASE:

Respectfully submitted, when there are inaccuracies, or twists, in Minutes, the resulting long term outcome can be affected, as well as a bias conveyed through omission.

I would like to request, please, that an amendment be placed in the Speaker's Section for the LAFCO Minutes of March 11, 2016, which accurately reflects my written and spoken words. I believe, if it is acceptable, I will prepare a computerized statement, attach it to the Speaker Card, with plans to attend on June 1, 2016.

I would appreciate verbatim accuracy, if possible, reflected as my words, please. This is critical, as falsifications or critical omissions in government can be serious, especially, if processed through the Santa Clara County Grand Jury Court process which oversees, where shortfalls in truth can interact with laws of perjury.

Furthermore, I want my objectives and goals, with a business for Borina Tennant Enterprises, LP to be consistently conveyed and communicated, consistent with my attorney's letter of 2014, to the City of Morgan Hill Planning Commission, presented at the Morgan Hill Planning Commission Meeting, with a copy of the letter to the Morgan Hill City Council. This letter outlined the allowed land uses.

The importance for accuracy will also become a Grand Jury filing, to accompany the previous one, whereby, there was no financial analysis process from property owners taken into consideration in the voting process.

I believe this is critical, as no solid and serious plan can be credibly considered without the fundamental--budget and funding.

If these two critical factors in the analysis, do not exist, the vote is on faulty foundation, biased, due to political pressures, or other factors that are not based on practicality or reality, if finances are not even brought into consideration processes that really can govern the vote. Its a moot issue if the finances are in the red before the crop is harvested for certain property owners.

Ideally, financial feasibility checklist considerations would be a main checklist item with any major land use proposal plan.

FUNDAMENTALS--Most business entities would throw out any vote that does not have a very serious segment of financial analysis process, citing it as incomplete.

(Years ago, I did a reality based hypothetical financial analysis for Brandon and Associates, consultants hired by the City of Morgan Hill. A crop was taken from seed acquisition, with two workers, minimum wage--crop was in the financial red long before the harvest).

These types of reality based figures need to be considered in the land use voting process, otherwise, the voting is biased on emotional grounds, that really are financially irrational.

Respectfully, Emmanuel, I would greatly appreciate whomever is taking the minutes, like for the Meeting of March 11, 2016, that the individual be as accurate as possible and not twist the meaning, nor omit very critical content or context.

Five years from now, this can be truly critical to have this bias superimposed upon the words of the MH SEQ property owner.

We are under critical times--our nation's schools, as an example, are ranked 41, after continuously, ranking 5th.

I am planning to write letters to US Department of Education leaders. I want my request for a business to be taken seriously and included in the Minutes, NOT CONVENIENTLY OMITTED TO SWAY THE PERCEPTION IN A DIRECTION NOT ACCURATE NOR REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REAL DIRECTION I WISH TO TAKE BORINA TENNANT ENTERPRISES, LP--IN THE FUTURE, which is toward a strong business focus, generating strong income, to serve the Community and my family for the long term, while respecting the 50 percent agricultural mitigation.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO STRONGLY SUPPORT LAFCO RECONSIDERATION OF THE CATHOLIC PRIVATE SCHOOL PROJECT, AS I CONTACT US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICIALS, ONE OF WHOM IS THE SUPERINTENDENT OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, SERVING IN THE STATE LEGISLATURE, AFTER HIS COMMENCEMENT SPEECH ON 5/21/2016, AT MY COLLEGE ALMA MATER.

CALIFORNIA NEEDS TO REGAIN ITS RANKING IN THE TOP 5 IN THE NATION, AS A PRIORITY, A GOAL. (SILICON VALLEY IS OUR FINANCIAL BREADBASKET, WHICH NEEDS EDUCATION TO SUSTAIN STRONG). IF I CAN WORK WITH THE US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, THERE MAY BE A MONTESSORI-LIKE SCHOOL WITH A HEAD START PROGRAM ON MY FAMILY'S PROPERTY FOR THE GREATER GOOD OF EVERYONE'S FUTURE.

March 11, 2016--I both wrote and spoke. The Speaker Card and Points in the Speech were the identical. How the Minutes transcribed what resulted--was not in either form of communication.

The Minutes do not accurately reflect my message. This matter is important as I mentioned a critical point--I could have agricultural with a lucrative business on the property.

I RECOLLECT USING THE WORD, "IMPOSSIBLE" TO FARM, IN MY SPEECH ON MARCH 11, 2016, BUT THAT IT COULD BE DONE WITH A BUSINESS ON THE PROPERTY.

The Meeting Minutes omit this critical content and context.

THE FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AFOREMENTIONED WAS BASED ON THE PRESENTATION TO BRANDON AND ASSOCIATES, YEARS AGO.

More than fifty years, my family has owned the property on the Northwest corner of Tennant and Hill, known as Borina Tennant Enterprises, LP.

Government regulations have always been in effect. Workmen's Comp., insurances, wages. How the content was "twisted" in the translation is unknown. Those are not my words in the minutes, with possibly, a bias toward business, as it was omitted.

Thank you for your efforts,
Emmanuel. Best, Julie

Sent from my iPad

Abello, Emmanuel

From: Chris Monack <chris.monack@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2016 9:04 AM
To: Abello, Emmanuel
Subject: SCCHS Appeal

LAFCO Commissioners,

I am writing in opposition to the June 1 appeal being made by SCCHS to allow construction of their proposed high school in the Tennant/Murphy area of Morgan Hill.

The option to build a high school was part of the larger annexation proposal by the City of Morgan Hill. As the Commission denied the City's application due to an insufficient EIR, it would seem any option included in the City's application became subject to that decision. In that case, reconsideration of proposed development using the related report(s) would be inconsistent with the Commission's March 11 findings.

It is my opinion that the SCCHS action is less an appeal of the Commission's March 11 findings and more of a separate proposal to develop the high school. It would seem reasonable that SCCHS should be required to submit an EIR and related documents specific to their project instead of using parts of reports found to be insufficient in their entirety.

I support education and recognize the need for strong institutions to provide a solid educational foundation. However, as the high school was part of a bigger picture in the Southeast Quadrant that was denied and is now an individual venture, SCCHS should be required to submit an application and provide supporting documentation specific to its proposal.

I am asking the Commission to deny the appeal.

Respectfully,

Chris Monack

Abello, Emmanuel

Subject: FW: Dear LAFCO Commissioners

From: GrzanFamily [mailto:fam.grzan@charter.net]
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2016 10:46 PM
To: Abello, Emmanuel <Emmanuel.Abell@ceo.sccgov.org>
Cc: Palacherla, Neelima <Neelima.Palacherla@ceo.sccgov.org>
Subject: Dear LAFCO Commissioners

Dear Commissioners

I am disappointed that Morgan Hill's Urban Growth Boundary is back again for discussion and this time it is about the private school seeking expansion. Let me state this clearly, making policy decisions based upon who is making the request is simply bad policy.

Efforts to grant the school what is more or less an exemption is simply not in accordance to what public policy is all about. Public policy does change by any measure as to who is making the request. The school shall receive no special consideration, because it is a school. We set a bad precedent to allow that to happen in the past and it has to stop. Eventually any organization with an educational component could and should be granted an exception. Well, that must not be allowed.

As for the school, it is a regional high school and can go anywhere in south County. Why can't it go within the urban growth boundaries in Gilroy? That City has more than enough land and better suited to the needs of the school than Morgan Hill. Placing the school farther south in my mind would service the needs of Hollister and San Juan Bautista and even the Pruneridge area.

Children in Morgan Hill will continue to use the schools in San Jose and the north regardless of what happens in Morgan Hill or Gilroy. Children will go to Bellarmine or Presentation because those schools have their own reputation that is not bound geographically. I am a Bellarmine graduate and being 25 miles from the school was never a deterrent.

Our farmlands have an importance that we cannot conceive. We are not at the temperate extremes and are not feeling the effects of rising sea water, higher temperatures. Our lands are irrigated based upon an extensive water system. Other parts of the nation and other countries are not so fortunate. They are reliant on mother nature and when she turns with climate change in full effect it will be up to the lands in Morgan Hill to feed a county, a nation and a world.

Please vote for our future and that of your children and mine and preserve every acre of farmland we have. Reject Morgan Hill's request to expand the urban growth boundary. Preserve our resources and you preserve a nation. Should you approve, you will likely force me back into the public service and I will likely run for County Supervisor to undo what you have done.

Mark Grzan
Former Councilmember, Mayor Pro Tempore, City of Morgan Hill
Past Member of Morgan Hill's Urban Limit Line Advisory Committee
Current and Past Member of Morgan Hill's General Plan Advisory Committee

