

EAST PLEASANTON SPECIFIC PLAN



APRIL 8, 2013 TASK FORCE MEETING ALTERNATIVES REPORT

APRIL 8, 2013



EPSP ALTERNATIVES REPORT

BACKGROUND

Work on the development of three EPSP plan alternatives began at the February 7, 2013 Task Force meeting. This effort consisted of reviewing a site structural element plan, community components plan, and three plan schemes. Each scheme was based primarily on information provided in previous EPSP background reports, an opportunities and constraints analysis, the vision statement, and numerous comments from Task Force and community members.

Guided by input received at the February 7 meeting, staff and consultants evolved the three plan schemes into a more detailed set of “preliminary alternative plans” and provided a planning analysis of these alternatives at the March 7, 2013 meeting. Input received on March 7 was subsequently used by staff and consultants to refine the three alternatives and prepare additional planning analysis for each of them. The primary purpose of the upcoming Task Force meeting is to review the three refined alternative plans and receive input for further evolving them.

The following report is intended to assist the Task Force with general information pertaining to the three alternatives. Included is a preliminary land use analysis and traffic comments. In addition, a financial feasibility memorandum prepared by the City’s EPSP consulting economist for the three new alternatives is provided as a separate attachment in the packet for the upcoming meeting.

Following further review and refinement of the alternatives by the Task Force, the alternatives will be forwarded to several City commissions and committees for additional input. Upon the receipt of input from these groups, the Task Force can consider the comments and further refine the three alternatives for submission to the City Council. After approval by the Council to proceed, the alternatives will undergo the scrutiny of a much more detailed technical analysis by staff and consultants. This analysis is planned to include:

- Traffic impact assessment
- Utilities and infrastructure analysis
- Road system preliminary engineering
- Fiscal impact analysis
- Financial feasibility analysis

- Environmental analysis

Finally, after the detailed analysis is completed, the Task Force is scheduled to select and refine its “preferred alternative” for subsequent Council review, and analysis in the project environmental impact report.

OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES

The three new alternatives are presented below. Each was refined according to a number of common themes that were expressed at the March 7 Task Force meeting. It is important to note that the alternatives have had a tendency to become more alike as the planning parameters have been narrowed through the Task Force input process. The common themes coming out of the March 7 meeting included the following:

- Connect El Charro Road to Stanley Boulevard in all three alternatives. One alternative might use a more westerly connection of El Charro Road to Stanley Boulevard.
- Significant vehicular access to the Plan Area should be provided for all alternatives via the extension of Boulder Street from Valley Avenue.
- One or more alternatives should connect Boulder Street directly to El Charro Road.
- Busch Road should not be a boulevard - try to limit traffic on this road.
- Too much high density residential.
- 60 percent RHNA is too high.
- Explore using a compact residential development area (40 units/acre).
- Include a one-story small lot single-family residential product.
- Too much industrial acreage - replace some with single-family residential.
- Add a retail component to the northernmost parcel.
- Too much parkland.
- Both active and passive parkland are desired.
- Add a potential school site overlay to all alternatives.
- Move the Operations Service Center (OSC) and transfer station in all alternatives, if feasible.
- OK to contemplate moving the Urban Growth Boundary.

Housing totals for the three new alternatives have been modified from those used in the March 7 alternatives. The numbers for the new alternatives now reflect 45, 50 and 60 percent of the total RHNA city-wide housing needs for the next two cycles (2014-2022 cycle of 797 units, plus the 2022-2030 cycle of 2,054 units equals a total of total 2,851 units). As a result, the new alternative plan totals are as follows:

- Alternative 1 – 1,426 dwelling units (50 percent)
- Alternative 2 – 1,710 dwelling units (60 percent)
- Alternative 3 – 1,283 dwelling units (45 percent)

Retail use (2 acres) is proposed in all alternatives at the intersection of El Charro Road and Busch Road. Retail is also proposed to be integrated into the northern campus office area. These are the only locations where the consulting economist feels retail would be viable.

Finally, El Charro Road is proposed to be extended through to Stanley Boulevard, and Boulder Street is planned to receive a substantial amount of the Busch Road traffic. Busch Road is expected to be a total of two lanes in all three alternatives.

POTENTIAL RELOCATION OF THE OPERATIONS SERVICE CENTER AND TRANSFER STATION

During recent Task Force meetings, the Task Force has discussed the potential for the OSC and Transfer Station to relocate to the southeastern portion of the EPSP area. One possible way of achieving this might be through a land swap/relocation funding plan between the property owners.

In this regard, the value of the existing OSC and Transfer Station acreage is thought to be considerably greater than that of the potential relocation acreage in the southeast Plan Area. The reason for this is that the OSC and Transfer Station are located on potentially prime residential land. On the other hand, the land in the southeast area is highly physically impacted and located next to the Vulcan quarry facility, thus probably possessing far less land value.

One relocation scenario might be for the owners of the OSC and/or Transfer Station to arrange for a land swap with the owner of the southeast area land. In order to make up for the difference in land value between the sites, the funding of a large portion or maybe even all of the costs necessary to rebuild the actual facilities at the new site(s) might also be possible.

OPERATIONS SERVICE CENTER, TRANSFER STATION AND SCHOOL SITES

The alternative plans are primarily intended to show the ultimate land use and circulation system patterns planned for build-out of the EPSP. However, there are several variables (potential relocation of the OSC and Transfer Station, and potential construction of a school) that could significantly impact the plans, particularly in the ten-year timeframe. The Task Force has generally indicated its desire for at least the Transfer Station and maybe the OSC to move, if financially feasible. It is not now certain if a school will ultimately be needed by the School District within the EPSP Area, but it is important to plan for this contingency. At this point in the planning process, staff is recommending that the three alternative plans continue to show the final build-out scenarios, but that contingency planning also take place in the event that either the OSC and/or the Transfer Station do not relocate and/or that a school site ends up being needed.

Contingency planning is particularly important due to the significant impacts on the EPSP financing program that could otherwise occur. For example, if the OSC were to stay in its

present Busch Road location, then the number of housing units now planned for the OSC site would not be constructed. Thus the value that these units would have otherwise have contributed toward funding the infrastructure would be lost unless other arrangements are made.

Following are some thoughts about how contingencies for the three uses discussed above might work.

Operations Service Center – The 17-acre OSC is located in the western part of the Plan Area. All three of the plan alternatives designate this site for single-family residential development. In the event the OSC does not relocate, the number of planned housing units lost might be made up by somewhat increasing the single-family residential densities elsewhere within the Plan Area. This would be relatively straight-forward to accomplish by simply spreading approximately the same limited number of units over the large amount of outlying residential acreage.

Transfer Station – The 7.5-acre Transfer Station is more centrally located within the EPSP Area than the OSC. It is also planned in all three alternatives to include higher density multi-family housing. Not relocating the Transfer Station would therefore present more significant land use and residential density implications for the surrounding land. The number of housing units needed to replace those that would otherwise be lost by the Transfer Station staying in its present location would necessitate a re-planning of the outlying area in the vicinity of the site. More specifically, some single-family residential areas near the site would need to be re-designated as multi-family, and probably some local streets and open space areas would need to be re-planned to accommodate the changes in density. It does appear however that the land requiring re-planning would be relatively limited and readily able to be re-planned without negatively impacting the greater Plan Area.

School – The development of a possible 10-acre elementary school site would present similar plan implications as discussed above for the Transfer Station. The school sites proposed in the three alternatives are all centrally located within the EPSP Area. Each is also located in an area planned for multi-family housing. The number of housing units needed to replace those that would otherwise be developed at the school sites would necessitate a re-planning of the area in the surrounding vicinity. More specifically, some single-family residential land near the school sites would need to be re-designated to multi-family, and probably some local streets and open space in the vicinity would need to be re-planned to accommodate the changes in density. It does appear however that the land requiring re-planning would be relatively limited and readily achievable without negatively impacting the greater Plan Area.

ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTIONS

Alternative 1 – The residential development proposed in this alternative (Figure 1) is based upon achieving 50 percent (1,426 units) of the RHNA city-wide housing needs within the EPSP for the current plus following cycle. The highest residential density (30 units/acre) locations are centralized on the south side of Busch Road, with 23 units/acre to the immediate north. The community center is comprised of a village green and neighborhood serving retail just east of this multi-family housing area. Most of the remaining residential use is single-family low density, with a limited amount of 11 units/acre single-family. Residential development is planned along a portion of the railroad tracks in the southern Plan Area.

Three limited areas of “campus office” use are proposed: (1) in the northernmost portion of the Plan Area above Lake I; (2) immediately south of Lake I within the Airport Protection Area; and (3) east of the El Charro Road/Busch Road intersection. The northernmost office site is also proposed to include a retail overlay component to allow restaurants and related retail lakefront uses. Industrial use is planned in the southeast portion of the Plan Area to potentially include business parks, R&D, industrial/flex and distribution uses, as well as the possible future relocation of the OSC and/or Transfer Station.

Public parkland includes a 28-acre passive recreation community park east of El Charro Road, a 17-acre active recreation park along the south side of Lake I, and a 2-acre village green on Busch Road. In addition, it is hoped that some of the Zone 7 land east of the community park area can also be used for passive recreation use (i.e., trails and vistas) in all of the alternatives.

El Charro Road extends to Stanley Boulevard. Busch Road is designed as a two-lane street with two connecting routes to El Charro Road. In addition, Boulder Street is designed to extend all the way from Valley Avenue to El Charro Road (including through land planned for industrial use) to relieve traffic on Busch Road. Small local loop streets are designed to distribute and disburse traffic.

Table 1
Alternative 1 Developable Land Acreage*

SF-R >3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Retail	Campus Office	Ind./ Flex	Dest. Use	Pub. Park	Open Space
119	10	18	21	0	6	34	103	3	47	16

* Acreages have been rounded and are thus approximate.

Table 2

Alternative 1 Housing Units and Non-Residential Development Square Footage

SF-R >3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Total Housing	Retail	Campus Office	Ind/ Flex
295	110	395	626	0	1,426	91,000	515,000	1,396,000

Traffic – As noted above, Alternative 1 includes a direct extension of Boulder Street from Valley Avenue to El Charro Road. This is intended to help relieve traffic on Busch Road by providing a second east/west route for motorists through the Plan Area. It would also help to balance traffic to the Plan Area and distribute traffic more evenly on the El Charro Road intersections.

This Boulder Street extension would however connect two significant industrial areas through a residential neighborhood. The existing industrial development located west of Valley Avenue would be connected to the planned industrial area in the southeast portion of the EPSP Area. By connecting these via Boulder Street, the probability for non-residential traffic on Boulder Street would increase. It is important to note that the City’s "no trucks over 3 tons" law is only enforceable if the destination of the trucks is not on "a direct path" to its destination. With the Boulder Street through route, the City Police Department would have no legal authority to stop over-sized trucks from traveling on the Boulder Street extension (or on Valley Avenue).

Alternative 2 – Residential development proposed in Alternative 2 (Figure 2) is based on achieving 60 percent (1,710 units) of the RHNA city-wide housing needs within the EPSP for the current plus following cycle. The highest residential density (30 units/acre) is centralized on the south side of Busch Road, with 23 units/acre to the immediate north and south. The community focus is centered within the multi-family housing area around the intersection of Busch Road and the open space spine. Most of the remaining residential use is composed of single-family low density, with a limited amount of 11 units/acre single-family. Residential development is located along a greater stretch of the railroad tracks than proposed in Alternative 1.

Three limited areas of “campus office” are proposed within the Plan Area: (1) in the northernmost area above Lake I; (2) immediately south of Lake I within the Airport Protection Area; and (3) just south of the El Charro Road/Busch Road intersection. The northernmost area above Lake I is also proposed to include a retail overlay component.

Industrial use is planned in the southeast portion of the Plan Area to potentially include business parks, R&D, industrial/flex and distribution uses, as well as the possible future relocation of the OSC and/or Transfer center.

Public parkland includes a 37-acre passive recreation community park east of El Charro Road, and an 11-acre active recreation park along the south side of Lake I.

El Charro Road extends to Stanley Boulevard. Busch Road is designed as a two-lane street with two connecting routes to El Charro Road. Boulder Street is designed to relieve traffic on Busch Road through its extension into significant residential development areas.

Table 3
Alternative 2 Developable Land Acreage*

SF-R 3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Retail	Campus Office	Ind./ Flex	Dest. Use	Pub. Park	Open Space
120	10	21	25	0	6	42	89	3	48	19

* Acreages have been rounded and are thus approximate.

Table 4
Alternative 2 Housing Units and Non-Residential Development Square Footage

SF-R >3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Total Housing	Retail	Campus Office	Ind/ Flex
376	110	474	750	0	1,710	91,000	564,000	1,207,000

Alternative 3 – The residential development proposed in this alternative (Figure 3) is based upon achieving 45 percent (1,283 units) of the RHNA city-wide housing needs within the EPSP for the current plus following cycle. The highest residential densities, including a limited area of 40 units/acre and 23 units/acre are compactly centralized along both sides of Busch Road. The

open space spine extends through the center of this area, while the community center is comprised of a village green and neighborhood serving retail located along the east side of the multi-family housing. Most of the remaining residential use is composed of single-family low density, with a limited amount of 11 units/acre single-family. Residential development extends along the greatest distance of railroad tracks of all the alternatives.

Three limited areas of “campus office” use are proposed: (1) in the northernmost portion of the Plan Area above Lake I; (2) immediately south of Lake I within the Airport Protection Area; and (3) just east of the El Charro Road/Busch Road intersection. The northernmost site is also proposed to include a retail overlay component.

Industrial use is planned in the southeast portion of the Plan Area to potentially include business parks, R&D, industrial/flex and distribution uses, as well as the possible future relocation of the OSC and/or Transfer Center. This is the only alternative that does not propose any industrial land west of El Charro Road.

Public parkland includes a 26-acre passive recreation community park east of El Charro Road, a 15-acre active recreation park along the south side of Lake I, and a 2-acre village green near the intersection of Busch Road and El Charro Road.

El Charro Road extends to Stanley Boulevard in a somewhat straight-line configuration. This is a different alignment than used in Alternatives 1 and 2 in that it connects to Stanley Boulevard farther to the west. Busch Road is designed as a two-lane street with one connecting route to El Charro Road. Boulder Street is aligned to relieve traffic on Busch Road through its loop connection to significant development areas on both the north and south sides of Busch Road.

Table 5
Alternative 3 Developable Land Acreage*

SF-R >3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Retail	Campus Office	Ind./ Flex	Dest. Use	Pub. Park	Open Space
141	0	15	0	14	6	32	105	3	43	21

* Acreages have been rounded and are thus approximate.

Table 6

Alternative 3 Housing Units and Non-Residential Development Square Footage

SF-R >3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Total Housing	Retail	Campus Office	Ind/ Flex
363	0	356	0	564	1,283	91,000	486,000	1,422,000

Traffic – Alternative 3 contains a more westerly connection of El Charro Road to Stanley Boulevard than Alternatives 1 and 2. The City Traffic Engineer was asked if this might present any particular benefits or problems. He did not believe that this limited adjustment of El Charro Road to the west would create any substantial change to traffic flow.

The further east the connection is made, the less inclined south Pleasanton residents would be to use El Charro Road to get to I-580. However, the further west the connection is made, the less inclined east Livermore residents would be to use El Charro Road to get to I-580 or Stoneridge Drive. Ultimately, there is a greater volume of traffic coming from west Livermore that would want to use El Charro Road, and removing this traffic from Santa Rita Road (their current route) would provide benefit to south Pleasanton drivers as they commonly use Santa Rita Road for their trips (south Pleasanton has a smaller percentage whose trip ends are at I-580 or BART).

The Traffic Engineer would prefer to facilitate the east Livermore vehicles. In the AM peak hour this traffic currently uses Valley Avenue and Santa Rita Road to get to the Hacienda Business Park and BART. This westbound Stanley Boulevard traffic far exceeds the northbound Bernal Avenue volume. Additionally, the traffic from south Pleasanton has more localized destinations (schools and shopping) and its trip percentage going to I-580 is much lower than the volume coming from Livermore. So a more easterly alignment would tend to provide benefit to the greatest number of vehicles and provide the greatest benefit to Pleasanton since the Livermore traffic uses El Charro Road instead of Santa Rita Road (which is very congested). The removal of congestion on Santa Rita Road would allow for greater mobility of residents from south Pleasanton that may likely choose Valley Avenue to Santa Rita Road because their destination is not the Hacienda Business Park or BART.

The reverse pattern also holds true for the PM peak hour where vehicles coming from Dublin, the Hacienda Business Park and BART travel south on Santa Rita Road to Valley Avenue to get

to eastbound Stanley Boulevard. Having the alignment to the east would make El Charro Road the more attractive route for these vehicles.

Ultimately however, the difference between the two El Charro Road connection alignments to Stanley Boulevard shown in the alternatives would be minimal.

In a related matter, as the El Charro Road/Stanley Boulevard intersection moves toward the west, the UPRR train tracks get closer to Stanley Boulevard which means the amount that Stanley Boulevard would have to be depressed at the El Charro Road intersection might become greater, thus presenting potential engineering and cost issues.

COMPARATIVE LAND USE INVENTORY

The comparative inventory of land uses, intensities and densities specific to each of the three alternatives is presented in the following tables:

Table 7
Developable Land Acreage*

Alt.	SF-R >3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Retail	Campus Office	Ind./ Flex	Dest. Use	Pub. Park	Open Space
1	119	10	18	21	0	6	34	103	3	47	16
2	120	10	21	25	0	6	42	89	3	48	19
3	141	0	15	0	14	6	32	105	3	43	21

* Acreages have been rounded and are thus approximate.

Table 8
Housing Units and Non-Residential Development Square Footage

Alt.	SF-R >3d/a	SF-R 11d/a	MF-R 23d/a	MF-R 30d/a	MF-R 40d/a	Total Housing	Retail	Campus Office	Ind/ Flex
Alt-1	295	110	395	626	0	1,426	91,000	515,000	1,396,000
Alt-2	376	110	474	750	0	1,710	91,000	640,000	1,207,000
Alt-3*	363	0	356	0	564	1,283	93,000	486,000	1,422,000

DEVELOPMENT IMAGES

A series of land development images (photos) has been assembled showing the kinds of potential land uses, intensities and densities that might be envisioned for the EPSP area. At the upcoming Task Force meeting, staff will be seeking input from the Task Force regarding the images so they too can evolve along with the actual alternative plans.

Figure 1



- | | |
|--|---|
|  Zone 7 Open Space |  Residential < 3 DU/AC |
|  Private Open Space |  Residential 11 DU/AC |
|  Public Parks |  Residential 23 DU/AC |
|  Campus Office |  Residential 30 DU/AC |
|  Destination Use |  Industrial |
|  Retail |  Potential School Site |

EPSP ALTERNATIVE I

April 8, 2013

Figure 2



- Zone 7 Open Space
- Private Open Space
- Public Parks
- Campus Office
- Destination Use
- Retail
- Residential <3 DU/AC
- Residential 11 DU/AC
- Residential 23 DU/AC
- Residential 30 DU/AC
- Industrial
- Potential School Site

EPSP ALTERNATIVE 2

April 8, 2013

Figure 3



- Zone 7 Open Space
- Private Open Space
- Public Parks
- Campus Office
- Destination Use
- Retail
- Residential < 3 DU/AC
- Residential 23 DU/AC
- Residential 40 DU/AC
- Industrial
- Potential School Site

EPSP ALTERNATIVE 3

April 8, 2013