



SUMMARY OF MEETING #10

Summary of East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force Meeting #10

Thursday, August 1, 2013, 6:30 PM

Pleasanton Operations Service Center • 3333 Busch Road

Task Force Members in Attendance:

John Casey, Housing Commissioner
Brad Hottle, Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Colleen Winey, Zone 7 Water Agency
Robert Gonella, Danbury Park
Patrick Costanzo, Kiewit
Kellene Cousins, Mohr/Martin
Steve Dunn, Lionstone Group/Legacy Partners
Jay Galvin, Stoneridge Park
Erin Kvistad, Ironwood
Bob Russman, Village at Ironwood
Kay Ayala, At-Large Representative
Ken Mercer, At-Large Representative
Brock Roby, At-Large Representative
Bob Shapiro, At-Large Representative

Staff Present:

Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development
Janice Stern, Planning Manager
Mike Tassano, Traffic Engineer
Pamela Ott, Economic Development Director

Consultants Present:

Wayne Rasmussen, Rasmussen Planning, Inc.
David Gates, Gates + Associates
Gail Donaldson, Gates + Associates
Jason Moody, EPS
Kathrin Tellez, Fehr & Peers
Chuck McCallum, Kier & Wright

I. Welcome and Prior Meeting Summary Notes

A. Welcome and Agenda Overview – Brian Dolan called the meeting to order at 6:35 PM and welcomed the audience. He also briefly reviewed the meeting agenda.

B. Action Regarding Meeting #9 Summary Notes - The Task Force meeting summary of June 6, 2013 was unanimously approved without changes.

II. Meeting Open to the Public

There were no public comments.

III. Planning Process Update

A. City Council Comments on EPSP Options – Janice Stern reviewed the City Council's comments of July 18, 2013 regarding the EPSP options, including the following:

- Reduce the number of options
- RHNA to be accommodated – need balance city-wide; no more than 50 percent of RHNA to be included in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area
- Retain highest housing option, at least for study purposes
- Desired ratio of single-family versus multifamily – no more than 50 percent multifamily
- Housing density focused with feathering to lower density on edges
- Agreed with Task Force on curvilinear streets.

B. Recent Plan Option Refinements – Brian Dolan reviewed the recent refinements to the EPSP options resulting from the July 18, 2013 City Council meeting input.

C. Task Force Questions and Answers – There were no questions at this time.

IV. Technical Report Presentations

A. Traffic Analysis – Kathrin Tellez provided an overview of the traffic analysis prepared for the current EPSP options. The analysis focused on trip generation, daily roadway volumes, comparison of EPSP Area roadway characteristics, and a comparison of traffic to the recent General Plan Housing Element projections. She also presented the projected daily trips per option and critiqued each option, per the findings in her report. Finally, Ms. Tellez noted that future traffic studies will examine internal and external roadway volumes and impacts.

Pat Costanzo asked if the impact analysis looked at two lanes only on El Charro (no).

B. Utility, Infrastructure and Water Supply Preliminary Engineering – Chuck McCallum discussed the engineering and Water Supply Assessment reports contained in the Task Force meeting packet and further noted the following:

- Preliminary street sections for El Charro Road, Busch Road and Boulder Street have been developed for study purposes.

- The current availability of recycled water for potential use in EPSP development could allow a substantial trade-off for the use of potable water.
- Sewage is being planned to drain north to the Stoneridge Drive system. A sewage pump station may be necessary in the vicinity of the Lake I park to accommodate this concept. It is presently anticipated that no off-site sewage improvement costs will be required.
- Storm water is being planned to drain east to Cope Lake, and west to the existing City drainage system.

Coleen Winey noted that a traffic signal and /or protected left-turn lanes will be required on El Charro Road for trucks accessing the Zone 7 Pump Station. She also indicated that Zone 7 will provide comments to City staff on the Water Supply Assessment report.

C. Fiscal Impact Analysis – Jason Moody indicated that all of the four current EPSP options were projected to yield fiscally positive annual results as follows:

- Option 1 - \$924,122
- Option 4 - \$387,062
- Option 5 - \$951,577
- Option 6 - \$1,402,378

D. Financial Feasibility Analysis – Jason Moody presented the assumptions and results of the latest economic feasibility analysis for the four current EPSP options. The results of the analysis included the following:

- Medium to high density single-family housing and duplexes are the most profitable
- High density apartments (30 du/ac) are the least feasible
- Retail is feasible, assuming strong occupancy
- Office and industrial products are likely to require further market improvements to justify development
- Options 6 and 7 are the most feasible
- Options 4 and 5 are marginally feasible to infeasible
- Option 1 is likely infeasible.

Steve Dunn indicated that he had some significant disagreements with the financial feasibility analysis. He felt that Option 7 presented in the analysis is within the realm of what would work. He also stated that the City's growth management program is a potential major issue because it could prolong the financing of EPSP development.

Pat Costanzo supported Steve Dunn's comments. He felt that the residual land values indicated in the financial analysis were high. He also noted his belief that EPSP development will require fee credits.

Kay Ayala commented that RHNA housing should be placed near mass transit facilities and not in places like East Pleasanton. She also suggested two additional EPSP options for the Task Force to consider. The first is to partner with the EBRPD to publically acquire the EPSP Area for recreational purposes. Second is to develop a senior housing community that would not impact schools.

Pat Costanzo discussed and supported the Option 7 concept (1,759 housing units) that was evaluated in the financial analysis.

V. Land Use Plan Options

A. Task Force Discussion and Input Regarding Option Plans and Evolving a Preferred Plan – Brian Dolan presented three option plan refinement related questions that he recommended the Task Force address. The responses could then be used to help staff evolve toward a preferred plan and CEQA alternatives for review by the Task Force at its September 5, 2013 meeting. Questions included the following:

- Total number of housing units?
- Ratio of single-family vs. multifamily housing units?
- Central focus vs. dispersed multi-family housing units?

Task Force members then divided into three groups to address the three questions and other desired related plan refinement matters. Following discussion, each of the three groups presented their comments as outlined below.

GROUP 1 (Brock Roby, presenter):

- Number of housing units - between Options 5 and 7 (1,430 – 1,759 units)
- Single-family 63% / multifamily 37%
- Support creative financing ideas
- Multifamily central focus is OK
- Include senior housing in the mix
- Keep the BMR units in multi-family

GROUP 2 (Bob Russman, presenter):

- Number of housing units – 1,759
- Single-family/multifamily ratio either 60/40 or 65/35
- Disburse multi-family housing
- Make sure school is adjacent to park
- Transfer Station should move. At least keep Transfer Station traffic off of Busch Road.

GROUP 3 (Pat Costanzo, presenter)

- Preferred Plan 7 (1,759 units)
- Would support Plan 6 if needed for financial feasibility - 2,279 units
- OK with single-family/multifamily ratio of 50/50
- Dispersed multifamily housing

- Give each developer a 30 DUA project so they can transfer BMRs
- Locate school with park as underlying zoning vs. residential
- Alternate - put school on OSC site
- Provide underlying residential on Transfer Station site as additional units (above the 1759) and eliminate them from paying for infrastructure
- Liked the idea of establishing a sunset timing for the Transfer Station to move in order to receive single-family residential density
- Liked idea of senior housing in moderation.

Kay Ayala asked that additional study be given regarding the potential for relocation credits for the Transfer Station.

Peter MacDonald, representing the Pleasanton Garbage Service, indicated that it might cost roughly \$20 million to relocate the Transfer Station.

VI. Task Force and Staff Brief Announcements

There was no discussion on this item.

VII. Summary and Next Steps

The next Task Force meeting was scheduled for September 5, 2013.

Close

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 PM.

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