



SUMMARY OF MEETING #6

Summary of East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force Meeting #6

Thursday, February 7, 2013, 6:30 p.m.
Harvest Park Middle School • 4900 Valley Avenue

Task Force Members in Attendance:

Planning Commissioner, Kathy Narum
Planning Commissioner, Jennifer Pearce
Housing Commissioner, John Casey
Housing Commissioner, Joseph Butler (Alternate)
Parks and Recreation Commissioner, Brad Hottle
Patrick Costanzo, Kiewit
Steve Dunn, Lionstone Group/Legacy Partners
Colleen Winey, Zone 7 Water Agency
Nancy Allen, Danbury Park
Jay Galvin, Stoneridge Park
Erin Kvistad, Ironwood
Heidi Massie, Autumn Glen/Heritage Valley
Bob Russman, The Village at Ironwood
Bob Shapiro, At-Large Representative
Mark Emerson, At-Large Representative
Ken Mercer, At-Large Representative
Robert Silva, At-Large Representative

Staff Present

Nelson Fialho, City Manager
Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development
Janice Stern, Planning Manager
Robin Giffin, Senior Planner
Mike Tassano, Traffic Engineer

Consultants Present

Wayne Rasmussen, Rasmussen Planning, Inc.
David Gates, Gates + Associates
Gail Donaldson, Gates + Associates

I. Welcome and Prior Meeting Notes

A. Welcome and Agenda Overview – Brian Dolan called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM, welcomed the audience, and gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda.

B. Review and Approval of the Meeting #5 Summary - The Task Force meeting summary of December 6, 2012 was unanimously approved as submitted.

II. Meeting Open to the Public

Don Kahler, Pleasanton Gravel Company, provided a series of comments (verbally and in written form) relating to specific wording in the “EPSP Preliminary Background Report” and the “EPSP Environmental Conditions Report” prepared for the EPSP project by the City’s consulting team. Don Kahler’s comments are provided in a written format in Attachment 1.

Kay Ayala stated that City staff had introduced the potential for a General Plan amendment to the Pleasanton Planning Commission that would allow housing within the southwest portion of the Airport Protection Area (APA) of the EPSP site. She then asked staff for clarification regarding this matter.

In response to Ms. Ayala’s request, Brian Dolan indicated that the Airport Land Use Commission was in the process of amending its plan for safety and land use compatibility around the Airport. One of the issues that had recently risen in this regard was the approval of an exemption for the City of Livermore to allow residential development within a portion of the APA. Mr. Dolan suggested to the Pleasanton Planning Commission that similar land use planning flexibility may be appropriate for the EPSP site. The Planning Commission did not concur and recommended that a General Plan amendment not be pursued to accomplish such flexibility. This matter was therefore not forwarded to the City Council for further consideration.

III. City Council Comments Regarding the Draft EPSP Vision Statement

Summary Presentation of City Council Comments – Janice Stern reviewed the City Council comments provided at its January 15, 2013 meeting regarding the Task Force’s draft vision statement.

Brian Dolan reported that he and Mike Tassano recently met with ACE Train representatives regarding their thoughts about developing a new train station at the EPSP site. Mr. Dolan indicated their response was “not very enthusiastic.” They prefer the current Downtown station location. The addition of a new station in East Pleasanton would be too close to the Downtown Station, so the Downtown station would need to be removed in order for an East Pleasanton station to be built.

B. Task Force Questions and Discussion – There was no follow-up discussion on the vision statement.

IV. Follow-Up Informational Materials

A. RHNA Housing Numbers Memo – In response to a question by Mark Emerson regarding changes to the Task Force membership, Brian Dolan indicated that Karla Brown has left the Task Force due to her recent election to the City Council, and that each of the two newly elected Council members will be appointing a new Task Force member in the near future.

Brian Dolan presented the “Updated RHNA Information” staff memo that focuses on the City’s multi-family housing inventory. He further indicated that the City needs to be conscious of future State housing cycles and provide housing opportunities for this accordingly.

B. Operations Service Center Noise Information – There was no discussion regarding the staff memo prepared for this item.

C. Task Force Questions and Discussion – Task Force members discussed housing matters with staff relating to: the implications of future State housing cycles both city-wide and on the EPSP site; that which happens once the City reaches build-out; how many housing cycles will need to be considered for the EPSP; legal implications on the EPSP for not planning enough housing at this time; planning for schools in conjunction with housing; and housing density housing development examples in Pleasanton.

V. Getting Started on Plan Options: Thinking about Alternative Community Structures

A. Presentation Regarding Potential Planning Frameworks – Brian Dolan provided an overview of the EPSP planning process to provide the context in which the development of planning alternatives is used.

David Gates distributed a planning document to the Task Force entitled: "Getting Started on Plan Options: Alternative Community Structures." Mr. Gates then provided a PowerPoint presentation detailing the document contents, including:

- Opportunities and Constraints Map
- Structural Elements Map
- Community Components Map
- Three site planning schemes

B. Task Force Discussion and Comments – Brian Dolan facilitated input from the Task Force and the public. Input was provided and recorded on flip-charts as summarized below:

Task Force Member Comments:

- Look at traffic circulation – the schemes seem to feed high traffic volumes into Busch and Valley
- Are there alternative routes for El Charro?
- Should we look at more detail at Cope Lake?

- East/west street orientation – not the best for sun angles
- Circulation – do the major streets/spines divide the community?
- Look at the Boulder connection – should this be the major connection instead of Busch?
- Prefer curvilinear pattern to grid (multiple comments)
- An alternative should look at El Charro not connecting to Stanley
- A social center is a critical element
- Traffic concerns – Valley is overburdened now. Need to mitigate cut-through traffic
- Need to understand costs of the El Charro alternative locations
- Busch is not the best for the primary east/west connection if the transfer station stays in its current location
- Need to look at sound abatement
- What would the school needs be in these alternatives? School traffic is a concern
- El Charro is essential as a north/south connector to Stanley (multiple comments)
- If the OSC and transfer station stay in their present locations, circulation on Busch will be impacted
- Need to understand costs – El Charro, schools – to consider feasibility
- Northern parcel was not discussed – it is a very important piece of the plan
- Should review park locations
- Check El Charro/Stanley intersection location vis-à-vis Valley/Stanley intersection (separation distance)
- Industrial uses have less impact to neighbors than more residential development
- Busch should be less prominent (multiple comments)
- Look at moving development more to the east – less impact on neighbors
- There should be more, smaller parks distributed throughout the neighborhoods

Public Comments:

- Need to see costs
- Need to identify potential school site
- Retail is necessary to allow residents an alternative to driving
- El Charro connection to Stanley is important

Brian Dolan distributed a questionnaire to the Task Force members intended to generate additional comments regarding the various maps and plans discussed above, and requested that the questionnaires be returned to staff by February 14.

VI. Task Force and Staff Brief Announcements

There was no discussion on this item.

VIII. Summary and Next Steps

Brian Dolan indicated that the purpose of the March 7, 2013 Task Force meeting is intended to review more detailed and refined EPSP plan alternatives and plan analysis.

Close

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.

For further information call Janice Stern at (925) 931-5606 or js Stern@cityofpleasantonca.gov

Attachment:

1. Don Kahler's Written Comments

TASK FORCE MEETING #1

EPSP Preliminary Background Report

Page 3 “The Pleasanton Gravel Company also owns a gravel truck hauling gravel along the East side of the “cope lake.”

Answer: Pleasanton Gravel does not own a gravel truck. There is no Haul road on the East side of Cope Lake.

Page 15-17 “Trail plans indicate possible multi-use trail along Arroyo Mocho/ adjacent to Vulcan Haul road. Zone 7 is building one.

Answer: The area is in the SMP-16 permit, under MSHA Requirements. Safety issue. Expires 2030 but will have to be renewed at least 2050.

Page 34 Discussion of Pleasanton Gravel property. Second sentence of paragraph one states, “The company also owns approximately 3 acres of land bordering the East Bank of Cope Lake which it uses as a gravel truck hauling to access El Charro Rd. and I-580 to the North.

Answer: False, there is no road bordering the East Bank of Cope Lake. The road starts on the North side of Cope Lake and ends at El Charro Rd.
It is physically impossible to haul gravel from the Vulcan plant on the West side of the Arroyo Mocho to HWY 580.

TASK FORCE MEETING #5

EPSP Environmental Baseline Report

Exhibit 2.1-1 Existing Hazardous Materials Constraints

Page 2-80 Site #15 770 El Charro Rd. is located at Rancho Del Charro over 4,000 feet North on the East side of El Charro Rd, not on the Southeast side of Cope Lake. Not part of EPSP.

Policy 4 of the conservation and natural resources element of the Pleasanton General Plan states, "Reserve all areas designated on the General Plan map as sand and gravel harvesting exclusively for the production of sand and gravel until such time as quarry operators have depleted the resources." Use of the EPSP land inconsistent with this policy should not be permitted. In particular, housing anywhere near the Vulcan plant can be expected to lead to complaints about noise, dust, vibrations, emissions, visual impacts and safety issues for the residents, even though they would be coming to a use that is nearly a century old.

The Baseline Report
Report P. 2-116

Discussion of "Minerals" states "2-11-2 – Key issues none". It should be amended to state, "any use of the EPSP land must not conflict with policy 4 of the Pleasanton General Plan, policy 4 of the conservation and natural resources element of the Pleasanton General Plan. P. 2-119 indicates noise measurements were made mid-day on a Wednesday. This completely ignores the greater sensitivity of the residential users to noise early in the morning and at night. The baseline report should be based on a noise study regarding the noise from the Vulcan plant consistent with its hours of operation, which are 4:00 AM to 2:00 PM winter and 2:00 AM to 12:noon in Summer. The Baseline report does not address issues regarding light from the plant or vibrations from the plant. All of these factors call for a very large buffer zone from any potential housing development in the EPSP area.