P13-1858, City of Pleasanton, East Pleasanton Specific Plan
Project update and discussion of four working draft specific plan alternatives for an approximately 1,100 acre area east of Martin Avenue and Valley Avenue, north of Stanley Boulevard, and south of Arroyo Mocho. Zoning for the approximately 235 acres of this property that is within the City of Pleasanton is P (Public and Institutional) and I-G-40 (General Industrial, 40,000 square foot minimum lot size).

Janice Stern introduced the item by presenting a brief update of the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force activities, noting that the Task Force is now at the point where four Working Draft Alternative Plans have been developed that are probably among many different types of alternatives that could be developed consistent with the Task Force Vision Statement. She noted that these four Alternatives have been brought before various City Committees and Commissions over the last month for feedback and input and are now before the Planning Commission for the same purpose.

Ms. Stern then introduced Wayne Rasmussen, lead of the team of consultant for this project, which includes David Gates of David Gates and Associates, landscape architect; Jason Moody of Economic and Planning Systems (EPS), project economist; and traffic consultants and environmental consultants, who will be presenting the Draft Alternatives. She added that she will be providing the information about housing partway through that presentation.

Chair Blank requested Ms. Stern to give some information on Mr. Rasmussen's background for the benefit of those who do not know him.

Ms. Stern stated that Mr. Rasmussen worked with the City of Pleasanton for many years as Principal Planner up to about 2005 and was a consultant on some other projects, including the Bernal Property. She noted that Mr. Rasmussen knows a lot about the East Pleasanton area and is assisting the City with this project.

Chair Blank welcomed Mr. Rasmussen, noting that he looked remarkably relaxed.

Wayne Rasmussen thanked Chair Blank, stating that it certainly was good to be back and see everyone again. He started his PowerPoint presentation and gave a brief overview of the East Pleasanton site and the planning process and alternatives that have been developed to date.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the site is located just to the south of I-580 and just to the north of Stanley Boulevard, with Valley Avenue to the east and Busch Road extending into the project area, a 1,100-acre site of which about 700 acres consist of lakes and some habitat area that are either owned or will soon be owned by Zone 7. He noted that the land has been dedicated over time and will continue to be by the quarry operators who mine it. He added that other important land holdings within the plan area include the City of Pleasanton's Operations Services Center (OSC) and the Pleasanton Garbage Service (PGS) transfer station, both located off of Busch Road; Kiewit, which owns about 50 acres; 314 acres of the remaining potentially developable area owned

mostly by the Lionstone Group; and 17 acres owned by Legacy Partners. He pointed out the location of Vulcan Materials Company's quarry site, which is important from the standpoint of the potential impacts it might create on development in this area. He noted that one of the studies that has been completed for the Task Force is an Opportunities and Constraints Analysis.

Mr. Rasmussen continued that the important thing to point out again at tonight's meeting are the lakes and open space areas, consisting of about 700 acres with the exception of three acres which are privately owned. He noted that because this is all public property, no real planning is being done for that area other than the extension of El Charro Road through the area, as called for by the General Plan, and an attempt to get some potential use of the lakes and the habitat area around them for limited recreational use such as trails. He pointed out a sensitive plant area, shown in dark brown on the site map, a lot of which is on Zone 7 land, some of which may be used as a possible community park site.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the site presents some geotechnical issues that will need to be engineered and that has to do with soil subsidence. He noted that these areas were mined at one time and then refilled with the soil but was not necessarily properly compacted for development. He added that these engineering issues are a bit costly and will need to be addressed as the planning gets more specific in the future.

Mr. Rasmussen then pointed out the location of the Livermore Airport and the Airport Protection Area (APA) on the site map. He noted that the key issue presented by the APA, consisting of a total of approximately 43 acres in different locations within the site, is that residential development is not allowed within it; therefore, there is a need to look for different types of uses for those areas. He then pointed to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) line located in a straight line right down along El Charro Road, noting that the planning area to the east of the line is outside the UGB, and the area to the west is inside the UGB.

With respect to the process, Mr. Rasmussen stated that the Task Force, so far, has completed the Background Information gathering phase, the Opportunities and Constraints Analysis, and the Working Vision Statement for the property, and is now in the process of preparing and evaluating a series of land use alternatives. He indicated that the Task Force has most recently prepared four Working Draft Alternatives, which have been presented to five City Commissions and Committees, including the Planning Commission, for their comments and input. He added that all these comments will be taken back to the Task Force for integration into the Alternatives, and then presented to the City Council for its direction to proceed with the detailed analysis of these Alternatives, including engineering, traffic, and environmental reports. He stated that after the Alternatives are analyzed, a Preferred Plan will be selected; the Draft Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project will then be prepared and will go through the public review process to provide the opportunity for the community to respond.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that available on line on the City's website are documents that the Task Force has developed over the past six months, including an extensive Preliminary Background Report on the site and the planning issues that impact it, Opportunities and Constraints Report, Existing Transportation Conditions Assessment Report, and a series of four Economic Market Assessments that track the different alternatives as they have evolved in order to make sure that the Task Force's proposal is going to be within the ballpark of something that can be built, but without overbuilding. He added that an Environmental Conditions Report that talks about existing conditions has also been prepared, which is about one third of an Environmental Impact Report.

Mr. Rasmussen then referred back to Ms. Stern to present information on housing and housing numbers.

Chair Blank stated that he is very interested in the campus office designation located in the APA and asked Mr. Rasmussen if he has any thoughts with respect to what would specifically be there, such as if the thought is to make them single story.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that he will discuss that when he presents the plans.

Ms. Stern stated that housing and how much housing should be in East Pleasanton has become a very central part of the discussion at the Task Force level, the understanding of which would be helpful as the City looks at planning for at least the next two housing cycles. She noted that the City is just about to start its new Housing Element Update for the period 2014 to 2022 and the following period that extends to 2030. She added that it is reasonable to think of a long-range plan that can look at taking a share of housing, especially since East Pleasanton is the largest vacant land within the City and is going to play a vital role in satisfying the City's housing needs. She indicated that broadly, the question is how much of the City's housing needs should be met in east Pleasanton; and then more specifically, how much of that multi-family and lower-density needs should be met there.

Ms. Stern stated that the City's immediate draft housing numbers, which has not yet been adopted by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) but is pretty close, is about 2,000 units all together. She noted that for its purposes to try and satisfy the very-low-income and low-income categories, the City is really looking at a housing density of 30 units per acre or more. She continued that there are also the moderate income and above-moderate-income categories, which are coming up next.

Ms. Stern then presented a map of what parcels within the City were included in the last Housing Element Update which, at that point, did not have current development proposals and a number of which are now off of that inventory. She noted that several of these sites that now have approved plans do not count in the inventory; therefore, new sites will have to be identified when the Housing Element is updated once more. She recalled, for those in the Commission who were involved in the last Housing Element Update process, that it took months to arrive at re-zoning these sites, starting off with about 35 sites, most of which were dropped off the map for various reasons.

She noted that there was a lot of discussion during that time, and staff looked at just about anything that could potentially be used as a site.

Ms. Stern stated that staff is not convinced there are a lot of other sites out there. She noted that there could be some in Hacienda Business Park, if the property owners and the City agree to less commercial development than the City anticipated or wants there, but there are not a great deal of other sites in East Pleasanton.

Ms. Stern then displayed a slide of an overview of the updated inventory of housing sites in the City, showing projects that staff believes are going to come off the inventory either because they will have approved projects in the 2007-2014 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) cycle (Auf der Maur, California Center, Nearon, and Pleasanton Gateway) or because it is not certain if the project will move through as a residential project (CM Capital Properties came in and received approval for some extensive commercial upgrades); and other projects that staff thinks will remain in the City's inventory in the 2014-2022 RHNA cycle (BART, Kaiser, Sheraton, Stoneridge Shopping Center, and Roche Molecular), which is less than 1,000 units to satisfy quite a bit of need over the next 16 years. She then showed on another slide that the City would need to plan for 797 additional units in the 2014-2022 RHNA cycle, subtracting the City's estimated 2014 housing inventory of 1,261 units from the 2014-2022 RHNA cycle need of 2,058 units. She noted that the estimate for the next planning period includes about 111 very-low-income or higher-density units, 405 moderate income such as a garden-apartment style sort of development, and 281 above-moderate units. She further noted that this is an estimate and may vary a bit, based on what gets approved and what does not.

Ms. Stern explained that staff does not really have much to go on in terms of estimating what the RHNA could be for 2022 to 2030. She indicated that staff is working from the assumption that it may be the same as that of the last period, and is aware that the numbers may change and will need refocusing once more information becomes available. She noted that adding in these assumed numbers for the period 2022 to 2030 gives a total of almost 3,000 units, with about 1,200 higher-density units of around 30 units per acre and around 800 of the garden apartment densities. She further noted that this would require quite a bit of an area which, translated into acres, would total approximately 40 acres of 30 units and above, about 35 acres of moderate-income homes, and 111 acres for above-moderate income homes if assumed that some are built at five units per acre, and others at slightly more dense than that.

Ms. Stern stated that this overview sets the scene regarding why the City is looking at East Pleasanton to help satisfy its RNHA numbers. She added that another big issue is the need to look at what that balance would be in terms of how much of this should be developed at a higher density, which would require quite a bit of acreage.

Ms. Stern then displayed a revised map of what was originally prepared during the Housing Element update showing the distribution of and the sites rezoned for higher density development around the City. She pointed out the different locations of

high-density units, defined in the General Plan as eight or more units per acre, including small zero-lot-line homes, two mobile home parks, major apartment locations that are the higher-density units, and the senior apartment complexes at Ridge View Commons and Stanley Boulevard.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the Alternatives planning process started with the assistance of David Gates, urban designer, in terms of the structural elements. He explained that these elements are the varied, most basic components of the site that guide how it would ultimately be developed in the future, such as the major constraints, the opportunities, and what the General Plan says ought to be there. He indicated that these consist primarily of the open space, which is primarily undevelopable and owned by Zone 7; the extension of El Charro Road down through the middle of the site and connecting to Stanley Boulevard to the south, as shown in the General Plan; and the extension of Busch Road to connect to El Charro Road, as also shown in the General Plan. He noted that these two are very important to the outlying City area in the hope of reducing traffic in the neighborhood. He added that the General Plan also provides a list of potential land uses for the potentially developable area, consisting of the major categories of residential of various densities, commercial, industrial, office, and public.

Mr. Rasmussen then displayed a development grid of the area, together with some alternatives, prepared by the designers to illustrate typical large block lengths and widths and give a sense how the street system might begin to look if this area were to be developed with residential and potentially other uses extending into it. He continued that the designers then went into curvilinear streets to give a sense of scale as to where the future major streets within the development would be expected to go, based primarily on distances, and the location for potential major drainage ways. He indicated that there are two major developers involved with this: the property at the lowest portion of the site, right at Valley Avenue and Busch Road, will have to drain to the west, which leads to a discussion about having a detention pond and entry area into the development; and the Lionstone property, which has a contractual approval with Zone 7 in conjunction with the dedication of Cope Lake to Zone 7, and its water would have to drain through a swale or some other drainage facility of that sort before entering into Cope Lake. He stated that envisioning a couple of waterways extending through the site, the scale of the major street systems, and these other givens and constraints really helps to give a sense as to how the land use planning will ultimately, probably need to go.

Mr. Rasmussen then displayed a slide showing where key community components such as parks, buffers, greenways, and such might go. He reiterated that 22 acres are privately owned and in the APA so they could only be used for office, retail, or industrial. He indicated that, given the input from the project economists and all the retail located mostly in Livermore, plus the 11 acres planned in Pleasanton, the thinking has been that this would not be marketable as a large-scale retail use, so that was removed from consideration. He added that as it would not be appropriate to locate industrial right next to the residential, what is left is office; and being close to the freeway, it is considered to be the best office land for the plan area because of that access.

In response to Chair Blank's earlier question regarding the type of campus office being considered, Mr. Rasmussen stated that there has been no conversation about the number of stories, but the thought is maybe a lower-scale type of development, one large campus facility or a series of smaller offices that are arranged in a sort of campus type of environment.

Chair Blank commented that the Commission talked about this matter in relation to the issue down in San Diego, that multi-story buildings and the APA do not mix very well.

Mr. Rasmussen affirmed that there is the airport to consider as well as its requirements. Going back to the community components, he noted that an area to the south, also located within the APA and, therefore, also limited in terms of having retail or residential use, and in close proximity to Lake I, is being considered for a possible active recreation park. He pointed to another 34-acre area right next to the Cope Lake facility, which is only inundated for a very limited portion of the year during severe rainstorms and which has been narrowed down to being what appears to be an ideal open space park site, with a possibility of trails and boardwalks going out into this major habitat.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that along with other community components such as the park, all of the Alternatives show a two-acre neighborhood retail area down at the intersection of Busch Road and El Charro Road. He pointed out that the project economist feels that is the only location where retail would be viable because it would need to draw from workers and residents in the plan area and is also accessible to others passing through this site. He added that there was not much of a market for that use other than at that small location.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that because the acreage of this site is so great, the plan also begs for an open space to extend through this site as there is really no reason to put a major street in that direction (north-south, parallel to El Charro Road) because it would dead end at the lake and at the railroad tracks. He noted that this fine open space would provide a very good service for children to be able to get to the park or to get to maybe a school that is located along the greenbelt. He added that the last thing in terms of community components would be major open space buffers around the outside of the site to screen it from Stanley Boulevard, the railroad tracks, and the storage area.

Mr. Rasmussen then discussed the Alternatives, stating that he would spend more time on *Alternative 1* than on the others because there are similarities among all the Alternatives. He stated that all the Alternatives show the campus office with some element of retail, based on the thinking that it would be just right perhaps for some lakefront restaurants or other retail in this area and then coming on down El Charro Road. He indicated that there are three acres in proximity to Lake H, Cope Lake habitat and water, and Lake I for which no use has yet been listed and which are shown as a destination use that might include something like a restaurant or two, or a conference facility, or some type of interpretive area, something special at that special location. He continued that farther down shows an active recreational facility by the lake, although

there would not be any possible use of the lake, except for visual access, because of the steep banks that go all around Lake I and Lake H. He noted that the office is being located within the APA, and the industrial is kept to the east of El Charro Road because of the quarry plant and the noise it creates, as well as the soils situation in the other area. He added that it would not be appropriate for residential because of the cost to extend residential services there and to take care of its soils problems.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that three of the Alternatives show the relocation of the OSC and PGS Transfer Station away from the residential to an area next to the Vulcan Materials Company. He noted that this is particularly true of the Transfer Station so this can become a much better community without the Transfer Station in the middle of it, and leaves a residential and office area, as well as the open space discussed earlier.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that Alternative 1 scatters the multi-family residential near Valley Avenue and over by the future El Charro Road, with the private green belt linking the two. He added that it also provides an extension of Boulder Street, which is in all the Alternatives, except that in Alternative 1, Boulder Street goes up and comes back down and onto El Charro Road, in addition to Busch Road, to allow for development to be able to come down and exit onto Valley Avenue without having to go onto Busch Road and past the neighbors, thereby dispersing traffic and not impacting the neighbors as much.

Mr. Rasmussen noted that all the Alternatives also show a potential school site; although the Pleasanton Unified School District (PUSD) is not sure if there will be a need for a school, it has asked to include a potential area for a school within the Alternatives. He further noted that the Task Force and other City Commissions and Committees very recently have asked that the location of a neighborhood park be considered in conjunction with a school. He then indicated that Alternative 1 has a total of 1,000 housing units, the least of the four Alternatives.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that difference between *Alternative 2* and Alternative 1 is that Alternative 2 is a more community-centered Alternative, with the multi- family located farther down and surrounded by single-family, and parks and non-residential areas located farther up. He noted that this Alternative is also the only one that provides for the extension of Boulder Street all the way through to connect to El Charro Road; the other Alternatives only bring it part of the way with the concern that industrial development may tend to use that road in order to go on Valley Avenue, and industrial should not be mixed with residential unless necessary. He continued that this Alternative has the spine with access to the park and has what most of the others do, such as the drainage ways with trails extending on. He indicated that the social area for this Alternative is by the Community Park, with retail and village green all within close proximity. He added that this Alternative also has the most office space and not much industrial; it also has 1,426 units which is 50 percent of the 2,858 units, earlier discussed by Ms. Stern, that would be necessary to meet the two cycles of RHNA numbers within the City.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that *Alternative 3* has a total of 1710 units, which is the most of the four Alternatives, and is distinguished by the relocation of the high-density residential to the east of the residential planning area. He noted that it has the same sort of social arrangement with a Community Park and neighborhood shopping, and also potentially provides for the school site between the two multi-family residential sites. He added that if there is no school, the area would be multi-family with a neighborhood park next to it. He indicated that it also has the spine, and in this case, Boulder Street curves back up and does not extend on through the OSC and the PGS.

Mr. Rasmussen then discussed *Alternative 4*, which provides for 1,283 units and includes 45 percent of the RHNA housing numbers earlier referred to by Ms. Stern. He indicated that this Alternative is distinguished by the fact that it keeps the OSC and PGS in their current locations. He stated that the OSC does not have any major implications for the rest of the planning area, and residential density could be made up by increasing the density slightly in the single-family residential areas or in other areas the City chooses. He noted, however, that the Transfer Station is much more of a difficult planning matter to design around, and because prevailing winds are in this direction, land to the east of the Transfer Station is designed to be industrial because of the odor, noise, garbage truck traffic, appearance, etc. He added that access to the Transfer Station would be by way of a route along Busch Road and then up to El Charro Road. He indicated that the multi-family units are dispersed on the eastern side, with the same spine and other assortment of land uses previously discussed.

Mr. Rasmussen concluded his presentation by stating that staff and the consultants have a series of questions that they would like to pose to the Planning Commission for comments and input.

Commissioner Olson made an observation that the housing information provided by Ms. Stern is critical information. He indicated that it is clear from the recent election and the emails that have come in on this item that housing is going to be a hot issue here. He noted that he thinks it would be good to include those RHNA housing numbers in what the Commission communicates, both to the other Commissions and to the public.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that El Charro Road is a little differently designed in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 and that he thought the design of El Charro Road followed the UBG, as shown in one of the slides that showed the UGB. He inquired where exactly the UGB is in relation to El Charro Road.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the UGB line extends down El Charro Road in a straight-line projection. He added that Alternative 1 shows all of El Charro Road within the UGB line.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if the UGB line shown in Alternative 1 is pretty close to the actual line.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the actual line is just a little way over from where it is shown right now. He noted that the other three plans show the line coming over to the west, and the reason is that this location would connect to the driveway at Shadow Cliffs and there is a median break and traffic signal there. He stated that another alternative is to bring El Charro Road straight down.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that all the Alternatives show some development occurring outside the UGB, and in a lot of cases, it is just parkland or industrial, except where the road curves, which has some of the other uses such as campus office. He inquired what the mechanism is that would allow development outside the UGB, and what would actually have to happen before that could be done.

Mr. Dolan replied that the language that addresses that subject gives guidance, but it is not crystal clear; the UGB was adopted, and then the language was incorporated into the General Plan such that very similar language appears in both places. He indicated that it essentially says that minor adjustments may be made, but it does not define what a minor adjustment is. He added that the General Plan talks a lot about the fact that adjustments will be explored, and the Task Force talked a lot about this, although there has been no resolution.

Mr. Dolan stated that the evolution of his thinking is to determine if the adjustment is minor relative to the immediate plan area or as a percentage of the entire acreage within the UGB, which affects the perspective on whether the adjustment is minor or major. He indicated that his opinion is that under any scenario, this decision will probably ultimately fall to the Council regarding what approach to take. He noted that he believes moving El Charro Road over a little bit to catch a little more area would not be anything more than a minor adjustment of the UGB. He further noted that the Task Force has been pretty consistent, and there is a general consensus, to go all the way out to the edge of the planning area, with the primary reason being to generate enough revenue in the development to fund the improvements; whether or not that expansion is still minor is the question, and staff does not have any answer.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Dolan if he is referring to the actual development where the industrial area is on the map.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

Chair Blank inquired what the process would be if it were decided that it is a major adjustment.

Mr. Dolan replied that it would then have to go to the voters.

Chair Blank inquired if it would be in a general election or any election.

Mr. Dolan replied that he was not sure it specified the type of election.

Commissioner Posson noted that the slide on the structural element showed a grid system, but the Alternatives deviated from a true grid system. He inquired if there is any advantage to looking at that grid system from the standpoint of optimizing the developable land or accommodating the property lines, or what is easier for the property owners to develop or even for circulation as a third element.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that this does make it easier for the property owners to develop, and it is a matter of working out whether a grid or a curvilinear system would be the most efficient way to organize the plan area to keep costs down. He indicated that a curvilinear system requires a bit more land because the geometry is not as efficient, probably by not a whole lot, but that is a consideration. He added that there has been a lot of discussion lately with regard to sustainability and some of the newer mixed-use projects and neo-traditional type plans that are based on the old grid system which dispersed traffic so that particular areas of a neighborhood do not bear most of the burden of traffic. He noted that in this case, the grid itself is self contained and does not change the traffic patterns of cars leaving the site because Busch Road and Boulder Street would take that off under all scenarios. He indicated that some people prefer curvilinear to the grid patterns because the latter has straight streets and looks monotonous, but others think that the grid system now may be more of what is happening today, and more of that is coming back.

Mr. Dolan stated that the Alternatives evolved toward a curvilinear pattern at the request of the Task Force; it was not necessarily staff's first choice but there was a consensus that that was what the Task Force wanted and thought it felt more like the rest of the town.

Commissioner Olson commented that the City does have a bunch of curvy streets.

Commissioner Posson asked Mr. Rasmussen how "major" is defined in the reference made to "major open space buffer" along the railroad track. He expressed concern about noise from the railroad tracks and its impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that "major" has not yet been defined and indicated that there will be a significant need for setbacks from the tracks, combined with berming, to solve that noise problem. He noted that Alternative 2 did not maintain the grid system; the others tended to be variations from this and over time evolved out of this.

Commissioner Posson noted that Glen Cove and Ironwood are the two closest residential areas, with Ironwood being adjacent to the project site and Glen Cove being an older neighborhood farther up Valley Avenue. He inquired which of the Alternatives is closest to the density and mix, in the case of Ironwood, of these two neighborhoods

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the density in Alternative 1 is around four units per acre, and referred to staff for the density of Ironwood.

Ms. Stern replied that the density in Ironwood varies among the active community, the classics, the apartments, and so on, but the density of the single-family residential is probably around that density.

Commissioner Posson inquired if the multi-family is about the same as well.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the active seniors are probably eight units per acre.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if the current mix of single-family versus all other higher density in the City is about 25 percent to 75 percent or something like that.

Ms. Stern replied that the current mix is about 25-percent multi-family, including units and structures of five or more units, with the rest being single-family.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that all four Alternatives are higher in density, with Alternative 1 being the lowest, but still higher than the current mix. He inquired if it was around 35 percent or 40 percent.

Mr. Rasmussen confirmed that all the Alternatives are higher than the current mix. He noted that one of the primary questions that has come out of the Task Force process is whether the East Pleasanton neighborhood is being developed to be just like the rest of town or if this one major planning area is being used to accommodate the City's future RHNA assignments.

Ms. Stern stated that most of the Alternatives are about 50 percent. She added that it would also depend on whether or not the moderate are also counted.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired what the next step would be if more single-family were added to Alternative 1 to arrive at a 25-percent to 75-percent split, and the City gets RHNA numbers that are higher than what the City currently has zoned for.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the City will have to find sites for whatever RHNA numbers are left over, noting that even at 50 percent, the City would have more sites than what it had at the last Housing Element Update.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that it could involve rezoning within East Pleasanton as well as the rest of the City and inquired if staff is looking at rezoning or upzoning.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that it had never occurred to him to come back and upzone in East Pleasanton after the plan is completed. He added that staff would be comparing that option against other options out in the existing neighborhoods.

Chair Blank stated that he recalls the conversations the Commission had about creating an area where there is nothing but high-density housing and the cautions the Commission received about putting all the high-density housing in one area when it was trying to figure out how to spread this throughout the City.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the Commission even had presentations by nonprofits who cautioned the Commission about putting everything in one spot.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Heather Liang stated that she is a six-year resident and a Homeowners Association Board member of the Ironwood community. She indicated that she has been involved with this process for a long time and that she has noted almost all of the same concerns that have been brought up. She indicated that she came from Milpitas, Union City, and Fremont, and made her way up to Pleasanton to find a neighborhood that she wanted for her children who are now four and six years old. She noted that when she bought her house, she was told that the land right across the street from her house was not going to be zoned for this type of Alternatives, and never in her wildest dreams did she think she would be sitting here right now looking at all these plans. She added that she is very open to making this work best for the City; however, she is also on the side of trying to make this not a scapegoat for putting all the RHNA numbers.

Ms. Liang stated that the City needs to make sure it keeps the community similar in nature to why the residents of Ironwood and surrounding communities bought their houses here. She asked that a balance be kept, a common theme with all the members of the Board today, and make sure all of the opportunities for other areas in the City have been investigated, such as near BART or other rundown areas that were zoned for retail. She indicated that she does not have any idea but believes there has got to be something else out there that maybe has not been looked at. She reiterated that she just really wants to make sure that the City has exhausted all options before saying which Alternative will be selected, that the Commissioners would all be happy with the Alternative if it were in their backyard as well.

Ms. Liang stated that when she tells her my friends that live in other parts of Pleasanton about this East Pleasanton plan and how many units are possibly going to be built next to her house, most of them are clueless because they do not live next to it and will not be affected by it, but say they are glad they did not buy next to me. She stated that it is what it is, but the City needs to make sure that the rest of Pleasanton is aware of what is going on and that her neighborhood is not being used as a scapegoat for this exercise.

Nancy Allen stated that she agreed with the previous speaker and that she is going to say the same thing but in just a little bit of a different way. She indicated that the City has a tremendous opportunity to create a wonderful community on the East side, and she hopes it is done in a way that is best for the community versus as a scapegoat for RHNA needs.

Ms. Allen stated that she would like to address two questions that have been posed: the first is what the mix of single-family versus multi-family housing should be. She stated that in principle, she believes that the neighborhood to be created should be

somewhat similar in mix to the rest of Pleasanton, so as not to create some island needing different services, which has a current average percent of single-family homes today of about 75 percent. She added that it is actually 68 percent across the State of California. She indicated that Alternatives 2 and 3 are unhealthy as they create a community just the opposite of the rest of the City, with 67 percent to 72 percent of families living in high-density apartments, a rental type of community which creates a more transient community and where other issues occur because the level of commitment is more rental than ownership. She recommended a minimum of 50 percent single-family homes, closer to Commissioner O'Connor's recommendation and more similar to what Pleasanton currently has. She added that the City may take a little bit of a hit here if necessary, but it should not go all the way to 25 percent of single-family homes and 75 percent of high-density as that would create a whole different community.

Ms. Allen stated that the second question is how much of the RHNA allocation should be met in East Pleasanton, which is somewhat related to the first question. She indicated that she focused on the RHNA allocations specifically for just the affordable housing category, which is a little different from Mr. Dolan's numbers, and looked at low- and moderate-income and what the share is, which makes the percentages look even worse than what Mr. Dolan shared. She stated that she believes, as the past Council did, that balance is critical and that it can include units near BART because that is where transportation is and where jobs are today, it reduces pollution and gets the people where it is easy to get transportation, and it also eliminates traffic issues. She reiterated that Alternatives 2 and 3 really concern her as it puts 50 percent to 60 percent of the RHNA affordable housing in East Pleasanton, which is not balanced; furthermore, East Pleasanton is about as far away from BART as any area in Pleasanton. She recommended that the RHNA affordable housing allocation for East Pleasanton be at no more than 25 percent to 35 percent, which also favors an Alternative 1 scenario.

Ms. Allen stated that this leaves the elephant on the table, which is the challenge that staff has of what to do with the rest; where they go if they are not allocated in East Pleasanton. She indicated that she does not have all the answers, but she thinks it is related to looking, which has never been done yet, at the questions and having a process to look at the question of what Pleasanton will look like in 20 years. She noted that the last Housing Element cycle looked at today but did not look at where the opportunities will be in 20 years. She questioned what would happen if a referendum went on with this project and no housing could be developed there. She noted that she asked that question of Nelson Fialho, City Manager, and his response was that the City would rezone commercial property near BART or elsewhere in the City to residential.

Ms. Allen stated that she hates to put the cart before the horse and just dump this all on East Pleasanton because the City has not thought through a 20-year vision. She reiterated that the City needs to create a neighborhood that is right for the City and not just one for which we need numbers as that would not be healthy. She encouraged the Commission to take a long-term view and to do it really quickly. She stated that she thinks the City has a tremendous opportunity in a beautiful area to serve not only the

residents who live here but all Pleasanton residents with bike trails and walking lakes. She encouraged the Commission to treat this prime spot like a treasure and spend the time to look at where else a balance can be created across the City.

Julie Testa stated that she has been attending the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force meetings, and her message is that, while it is a great opportunity to create a new part of our community, everything should be done to mitigate potential traffic or any other quality-of-life issue so that there not be any financial burden on the existing community through additional taxes that might be asked later to mitigate any future impacts. She pointed out that one of the things mentioned was moving the PGS Transfer Station, and stated that the cost of the move should not fall to the ratepayers.

Ms. Testa stated that she does not think there has been proper acknowledgment of the overcrowding in the existing schools. She indicated that it has been a long 20-year mantra of hers to mitigate the overcrowding in schools, which has continued to grow and develop. She noted that PUSD has tried to downplay the severity of the situation in the community, and it says it may not even feel the need for another elementary school in the area when the reality is that every school in the District is significantly over-capacity, even prior to the approval of the 3,000 units in the rezoned sites. She indicated that even one elementary school would not come close to offsetting and correcting the burden of overcrowding that already exists in the schools because the greatest burden of overcrowding is at the high schools, where there no thought or possibility or opportunity of adding additional space.

Ms. Testa stated that in 2011, PUSD put out a school facilities fee justification report which says that the District's current projected enrollment is larger than the pupil capacity, which means that based on State classroom counts, the District, therefore, does not have sufficient capacity to house students generated by future development. She noted that these students will require the District to acquire new school facilities, and PUSD is saying it is not sure it wants to build another school. She indicated that what the community needs to fully understand that this will impact not only the nearby neighborhood but the entire City of Pleasanton, everybody who cares about the schools and about property values, because this will have a serious negative impact on traffic and commuting to schools as well as on the value of and quality of life at these schools. She added that current residents will be asked to pay additional bonds and taxes to offset this, once things hit critical conditions.

Ms. Testa stated that the 2011 report says that PUSD has 1,847 un-housed students, that its student-classroom ratio is at 118 percent over capacity, but what it is not saying is that the situation is so much worse at the student-land ratio, which, for Amador High School, for example, is at 160 percent over capacity today. She indicated that she understands the RHNA numbers; she understands that the District is an independent body and that there is limited authority to tell the District what to do, but the Planning Commission has the General Plan, its guideline, which spells out the expectation and the quality of life for the City's schools and specifically calls out school size. She pointed out that it is the Commission's responsibility to not be like ostriches with their

heads in the sand, ignoring this serious condition. She stated that she will give staff, and ask staff to provide a copy to the Commission, a list of all the documents and all the sites for all of the information on every school site size, land size, and current capacity. She added that the reason the District is not asking to build another school is because it has gotten itself into a $28,000,000 facility debt, and so as many houses are built, overburdening existing campuses will continue, resulting in negatively affecting the quality of life, not only at the campuses but throughout the community.

Chair Blank stated that he has personally known the next speaker, Sherry Barclay, for many, many years and that they have not discussed this matter. He added that he did not know that Ms. Barclay was going to be at the meeting this evening.

Sherry Barclay stated that what brought her here this evening is that she has also been attending some of the Task Force meetings and is concerned about the same thing that the other people have mentioned: the volume of housing intended to be put in this particular area. She stated that she lives in the Ironwood Village, the 55-and-older community that is still being completed, and previous to that, she lived in the Martin Avenue neighborhood for 22 years, so she is very familiar with that side of town. She indicated that what is being proposed here does not fit anything that goes over in that end of the town. She added that that other thing that was really surprising is that, for as long as she has lived here, Valley Avenue has one of the major traffic problems in this town, and yet a big multi-unit project has already been approved on the south side of Stanley Boulevard, and now another 1,000 to 1,700 housing units are being added, all coming out through Busch Road onto Valley Avenue and putting a lot more traffic in that area. She stated that her biggest concern is that she just thinks these numbers are way out of proportion for either the Valley Avenue, Stanley Boulevard, or her neighborhood, in general. She added that it goes without saying that the problem with the schools has been there for a long time.

Sean Sowell stated that from a work-force affordable-housing point of view, he would like to ask that the Planning Commission look at Alternative 3 most closely because he thinks this one does really the best job of including more people in the community who have been excluded from the community due to the high cost of housing here in town. He stated that he already lives in Pleasanton and that his son already goes to school here and will start high school in the fall. He indicated that work force housing and moderately-priced housing for people in the community is a good thing, and he thinks Alternative 3 probably does the job best, although he is not sure that the particular sprinkling of the lower- versus the medium- and higher-density units is really the best way to do it.

Mr. Sowell stated that in regard to this Alternative, he would like the Planning Commission to suggest to the Task Force to set aside a portion of the parcel to the north reserved for retail/office for some housing so the burden of housing is not restricted entirely on that southern portion of the plan area. He added that at the Housing Commission meeting a few weeks back, he had asked the Commission to look

at the possibility of reducing some of the industrial in the lower southeast portion for some housing to the west of El Charro Road and the UGB.

Mr. Sowell stated that he does not understand why the Task Force has not looked beyond the impact of the commercial and residential development on the Ace Train system and the BART train system and look at the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA). He requested that a representative from LAVTA, from the Wheels bus system, be given a seat at the table for Task Force meetings going forward. He stated that there are two routes that run East-West, on the north is the RAPID bus route; and on the southern boundary along Stanley Boulevard is the No. 10 bus route. He indicated that he does not believe either of those two routes could be changed to accommodate any development in East Pleasanton here because of the nature of those routes, and as far as he knows, LAVTA has not been involved in any of the discussions with regard to mass transit in that particular proposed area. He also asked that one of the PUSD Board members or the Trustees from PUSD have a seat at the table as well so PUSD can have a voice and a vote at future Task Force meetings. He noted that the liaison and communication will help address concerns raised by Ms. Testa and some others in the community. He further indicated that he is in favor of leaving the OSC in place, especially considering that it was recently renovated to create the Remillard meeting room.

Mr. Sowell stated that comments that more people coming to live in this community is somehow making this area or some neighborhoods around the border there a "scapegoat," or that residents here in town will be taking a hit by letting more people move here, or that traffic or other things will become worse by having this proceed along any kind of development, trouble him. He stated that Pleasanton is a community, and new people who move here will become a part of this community just like those who already live here, regardless of how long they have lived in town or whether they own or rent. He added that all the children go to the schools here, and all have a say in what goes on in the City. He concluded that he would like to keep things inclusionary rather than exclusionary.

Shelton Liu stated that when he moved into this new neighborhood in Pleasanton, he never thought that one day Pleasanton was going to be divided, just like Germany. He stated that this is not a question about the rich or the poor, but why people moved to Pleasanton. He indicated that this kind of planning is not the future for this person or a small community, but for the future of the whole City, and based on that, the principle to follow when designing this kind of new community is to be fair and use a uniform housing density standard for the whole City, starting from the West side, to the center, and then to the East side.

Mr. Liu expressed concern regarding traffic flow calculation, stating that there are gaps between the Traffic Division's modeling and reality. He indicated that traffic in the City is pretty heavy, and Valley Avenue is an example where the reality will totally change with this new development.

Blair Wolfinger stated that he lives in Ironwood Glen and has been following the Task Force since 2010 with the Housing Element, which has always been balanced. He asked that the Commission be balanced as well in its discussions. He indicated his support for the previous speakers, Ms. Liang, Ms. Allen with 25 percent to 35 percent mix, and Ms. Testa regarding schools. He expressed concern that the maps only include an elementary school and does not mention middle school and high school.

Connie Cox stated that she does not live in Ironwood but in Valley Trails, and for 20 years, she has been dealing with the flood issue in Pleasanton. She indicated that in her neighborhood, a gentleman came up with an idea of getting rid of the Old Bernal Bridge abutments, and they went to the City, and staff said they should have made that a condition of Laguna Oaks when it was built. She noted that through a lot of struggle, they were able to get the City of Pleasanton and the Laguna Oaks developer to split the cost to get rid of all the bridge abutments, which got the Valley Trails neighborhood out of the flood zone, as well as Val Vista, Ponderosa, and part of the homes off of Pimlico Drive. She added that they were always told that was a temporary fix and that the permanent fix was the chain of lakes, which they should be watching very carefully and be proactive on this issue.

Ms. Cox expressed concern that whatever these plans are, it should include a plan for the 100-year flood that is coming some day, because people's lives and their property are on the line. She indicated that she does not like how all four Alternatives cut into Cope Lake, which would allow water to drift out of the lake. She added that with the 100-year flood, they need the space, the lake, and the retention ponds, and staff needs to work with Zone 7. She stated that at a meeting she attended today, Zone 7 stated that its timing and the City's timing are a little bit off. She added that Zone 7 indicated that they have not finalized their plans; she added that she is not concerned about low-income housing but about people's lives and property. She thanked Ms. Stern and Mr. Rasmussen because she was involved in the housing meetings and she thinks they looked at every square inch in Pleasanton about where to put this low-income housing, and no matter what is done, someone is not going to be happy. She concluded that she thinks the City is out of space to put those homes. She then handed letter to staff that she gave to the Task Force.

Chair Blank stated that he was involved in some disaster recovery planning a few years back and noted that if the Del Valle Reservoir were breached when it was full, there would be three feet of water on Hopyard Road within about four hours.

Ms. Cox stated that this is one of the disclosures she, as a realtor, has to give people.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Pearce stated that in a past conversation about the relocation of the OSC and the PGS Transfer Station, the Task Force was very clear that it wanted developers to fully foot the bill for these relocations. She inquired if there have been

any conversations with developers since the last Task Force meeting regarding the financial feasibility of doing this.

Mr. Dolan replied that staff is aware that there have been conversations among the property owners, but staff does not know the outcome of those conversations.

Chair Blank stated that he does not think it has been a question the Commission has been asked and that he would like to get a sense of what the Planning Commission thinks.

Commissioner Pearce recalled that there were concerns regarding industrial truck traffic going down some of these roads when the Commission looked at circulation particularly about Home Depot, and the Commission talked about restricting the truck routes. She inquired if that is something that is done only for much larger trucks or only with larger interstate trucking, or if trucks can be restricted on certain roads as long as a route is delineated for them to go down specific roads.

Mr. Dolan replied that if this is industrial, there will be trucks, and there will probably be some cases of this size that you would regulate, so this is something that staff would have to look at. He indicated that for the most part, the fact that El Charro Road will be completed solves most of the problems; but there is no way around it, and there will be trucks on El Charro Road and on Stanley Boulevard, but hopefully this helps get them off of some of the other streets.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the Commission could certainly take a look at that and inquired if it could request that trucks use a variety of routes.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

Commissioner Olson inquired if PUSD has a seat at the table or what type of input have they provided into the Task Force.

Mr. Dolan replied that PUSD does not have and was not assigned a spot on the Task Force; however it has had Board members and staff at every meeting. He noted that it is a regular agenda item on the monthly City Council-PUSD Board Liaison Committee that he attends. He added that he is actually speaking to the School Board on Tuesday night. He indicated that there is a lot of back and forth, and ultimately, it is an important and difficult decision for PUSD. He indicated that it would be very helpful if PUSD would decide because there is a fall-back land use if there is no school site, and it would affect the numbers. He noted that everybody is concerned about the numbers, and there is a lot of dialogue; the District is very involved, and so it is something it would have to work through. He added that if PUSD ultimately concludes that it need a school site, there will be one reserved for that.

With respect to the comment on the office in the northern portion of the plan area, Commissioner Olson inquired if that is part of the APA.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

Commissioner Olson inquired if the plan area would be accommodating the comment about 100-year flood plan and if that would be considered as part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Mr. Dolan said that was correct. He indicated that it would be evaluated during the EIR process and any impact on any drainage and flooding would be analyzed.

Commissioner Posson noted that the staff report states that all the Alternatives include approximately 90,000 square feet of retail. He indicated that he is having a problem identifying the retail because the red retail and the red residential on the monitor look pretty close.

Chair Blank stated that it is a little better on the printed copies.

Mr. Rasmussen displayed the Alternative 1 map on the screen and pointed out the two-acre retail to the south, and another four acres up north in conjunction with the office area. He added that there would be some lakefront retail as well, which is not shown but would be part of an overlay for the office area.

Commissioner Pearce asked Mr. Rasmussen to speak to the genesis of the creation of the three units to an acre versus eight or four, and why the variety of low-density designations in the different Alternatives.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that low-density becomes a bit of a left-over category when all the other land uses are taken out. He explained, for example, that he talked about the reasons for locating office and parks and industrial at specific areas, and once that acreage is taken out as not appropriate for residential, and then a certain amount of multi-family is put in a couple of locations, a lot of acreage, in this case, is left over for single family residential. He noted that once the acreage is taken and the numbers are kept down, the density goes way down. He added that it is kind of a strange problem that really low densities are coming up within the single family area because there is a lot of land left over, and yet the overall numbers has to be kept down.

The Commission then discussed the questions in the staff report.

Commissioner Pearce requested that because she is on the Task Force, she be the last with regard to the questions as she would like to get the Commissioners' input first before answering the questions.

1. ***Does the Planning Commission support planning for future development beyond the current Urban Growth Boundary?***

Commissioner Posson said yes, noting that he thinks it makes sense, in light of the overall planning area, to look at expanding the UGB.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that if the current UGB is expanded, it would include more acreage now in the City; and if whatever is outside, including the industrial, is moved inside, it leaves acreage for the City to meet the RHNA numbers. He added that moving the UGB farther and farther out would provide more acreage, and the City will continue to get more and more RHNA numbers at some point because the City has more acreage.

Chair Blank stated that he does not know how big a movement that is, so he does not know how much the City would be expanding the UGB or not.

Mr. Dolan replied that it would be less than 140 acres.

Chair Blank indicated that he does not know what impact that would have on the City's numbers.

Mr. Dolan replied that he does not really think it would have any impact. He explained that compared to the size of the area in the UGB now and adding that little bit, available land is a part of the formula, but he did not think there would be a dramatic change.

Chair Blank stated that his view would be that if there were no change, then he does not have a problem one way or the other. He noted that the question is one person's dramatic change might be another person's moderate change; so before he would be able to get a good read, he would need to see the information to know what the impact of that would be.

Mr. Dolan replied that there is no way to provide it. He explained that in terms of predicting what the RHNA numbers are going to be based on that movement, he would just be lying if he said he could tell the Commission what the impact was really going to be with a number.

Mr. Dolan continued that in line with this topic, there were two reasons why the Task Force picked that alternative and went in that direction, and where it pretty much came to a consensus that it could not move out: one was a concern about having enough development to support the infrastructure demands which are significant, and not require that to be all put on the backs of housing because it was concerned about housing numbers; and the second was this area is no garden spot and has a different look to it, leaving basically scarred landscape there and not the same as the rolling hills that surround and add to the beauty of the area.

Mr. Rasmussen added that this area is currently included within the City limits and so even though this is beyond the UGB line, it is also in the City and zoned industrial.

Commissioner Olson stated that based on what Mr. Dolan's said, he agreed with Commissioner Posson that it would be all right to move it, particularly relative to El Charro Road hooking up with the Shadow Cliff entry. He indicated that he feels strongly about doing that.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she agreed with Commissioner Olson. She explained that for all the reasons that Mr. Dolan and Mr. Rasmussen said, and these are all conversations at the Task Force level, she thinks it is a real potential win whether it needs to be done, whether it is minor, or whether it needs to be done by the book. She indicated that she believes it is a good option for this property.

2. ***How much of the City's future Regional Housing Needs Allocation should be accommodated in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area?***

3. ***What should be the mix of single-family vs. multi-family housing?***

Commissioner Olson stated that he thinks the Commission ought to stick with balance and try to maintain a similar mix as what the rest of the City has. He noted that looking at that relative to the UGB, he is reminded that for years the City had a housing cap and ended up having to do away with that. He further noted that it the City keeps a tight boundary, it will be forced to end up violating the current mix the City has.

Chair Blank agreed with Commission Olson. He stated that his view is that the Commission should not think about this as how much the RHNA should be accommodated but rather, start off with getting the 75/25-percent balance, or push it to 65/35 percent, and whatever that number computes to is the number. He indicated that he would not go below 65 percent and added that as Commission O'Connor pointed out, he does not know how many times, when the Commission was doing that initial housing sites map, people with vested interests with building low-income housing came up in front of the Commission saying, "Do not make this different; do not put it all there; you will be making a huge mistake." He stated that he would rather say, "Let us make it just like the rest of Pleasanton, and whatever numbers drive out of that, those are the numbers. If we have to go elsewhere to find the rest of the numbers, than we go elsewhere to find the rest of the numbers, and that is fine."

Commission Olson agreed.

Commissioner Posson stated that he was thinking that while the rest of the City is currently at about a 75/25-percent split, that could change in the future if the City finds more space within the rest of the City to accommodate any new RHNA numbers the City may have. He indicated that he does not know what the maximum would be, and it would be more problematic, as Mr. Dolan mentioned, to come up with a number today if we went with 25/75 percent today. He questioned whether the City would be able to

come back to the East side and start shifting that around in the future. He added that if the City is going to plan it, he would rather plan the East side and not have to come back and touch it. He noted that he would be willing to go with a little more high-density, but he certainly thinks that 50/50 percent is not the right mix; 65 percent would be about where he would want to be on single-family and no more than 35 percent on high-density. He added that he could go less than that for high-density, but he would target it at 35 percent. He stated that again, he does not know about the UGB and whether that block needed to be developed in order to fund the road, and the reason he was looking at it is if the City did not find the room.

Commissioner Olson commented that Commissioner Posson stated it very eloquently. He indicated that his sense is that the mix should be consistent with other areas of the City, and the City should look at the proportional amount to meet the RHNA demands for this development as well as across the entire City.

Commissioner Pearce stated that at the Task Force level, the theme that came up over and over again was balance, and it is not only balance within this development in terms of matching, or at least coming close to, the mix with the rest of the City, but balance with regard to RHNA numbers throughout the City. She indicated that this was a real driving force in the housing element discussions. She noted that she would hate to be perceived as, or actually be, dumping an inordinate amount of high-density housing here, and echoed what the other Commissioners have said, which she thought reflects a significant amount of the Task Force discussions.

4. ***Should multi-family housing sites be centrally located to help create a community local point or more disbursed?***

Chair Blank stated that he thinks it is really hard to answer this question without seeing some proposed plans and layouts. He indicated that, again, he would be looking for balance and does not want to see all the multi-family housing units in one location because that unbalances the property. He noted that some multi-family housing is certainly going to form its own unit because of the way it is put together, but it depends on what kind of communities get developed. He added that other than saying that he want a balance, he does not know that he has enough information to really answer that question with specificity.

Mr. Dolan stated that he would like to give a little more background on what the genesis of this question was. He explained that the Task Force had to come up with a land use pattern, and it does not know what the projects will look like. He noted that what really came up in the Task Force dialogue is that when staff and the consultants think about the fact that some density needs to be accommodated out there, and it sounds like they may be headed towards less than more, but you would usually put the higher density together around a central community point where there is walking distance to the retail and easy access to transit, have the park right there, and make a community out of it, the center and together, the reaction of the Task Force was that nobody really wants that much of that, so put a little piece over in the corner and separate it out.

Chair Blank stated that from that perspective, if there is maybe one side where there is a park, you build a community; and maybe there is another area where there is retail, you build a community. He indicated that he tends to agree with the Task Force that he is not really keen on having all of the multi-family housing sites in one specific location. He stated that he understands the problems but he also does not want to get in one of these situations the Commission had up in the hills regarding when a blob is a blob, and where exactly it is located. He added that he thinks this has to be done in a conceptual level, at least at this point.

Mr. Dolan stated that it just occurred to him where the Commission was going with the numbers and that it might be a non-issue because if the Commission will reduce the number of units to 1,000, and it wants only 25-percent multi-family, then the Commission is only talking about one project.

Commission Olson stated that he also agrees with the direction of the Task Force. He indicated that he does not understand why a community focal point cannot be created in a mixed situation and why it takes all multi-family to create a community focal point.

Commissioner Posson stated that he likes the type of mix in Ironwood where there is multi-family as well as single-family. With respect to looking at this from a focal point, he indicated that he thinks the closer the larger population is to the focal point, the more focus there will be within that community. He noted that it is not a direct answer of either/ or but a kind of a Ironwood type of mix of multi-family and single-family and trying to get that community atmosphere in the neighborhood especially around retail or some type of transit.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that within the City, he would like it to be more dispersed; but in this particular scenario, because he is a little more interested in Alternative 1, if the Commission is looking at 1,000 units at no more than 35 percent or somewhere between 25 percent and 35 percent, that would be somewhere around 300 units, and he would not have a problem putting that all in one location, which is about the numbers within the rest of the city. He noted that he would be more interested in putting that density of population near a park or near one of the major roads to get that volume of traffic out to the major roads faster, like maybe butting up against El Charro Road but giving them some access. He added that he would rather see the higher density closer to Lake I because it would be people on three- and four-story buildings who are going to be able to take advantage of the views of the lake, and it would also give an extra amenity to someone who is in a higher-density project; whereas very few people from a single-family home would get those views.

Commissioner Pearce stated that what she was actually thinking about what Mr. Dolan said that if the Commission starts decreasing the numbers, this matter becomes kind of moot. She noted that she is a big fan of community focal points and that the density of people in a walk-able community facilitates that. She indicated that she would be in favor of something that puts the denser developments at the core and then spread it out

in terms of lower-density on the outside. She noted, however, that with the direction the Commission is going in, she did not think there would be that kind of density to work with.

5. ***Comment on the use of land east of El Charro Road as a passive community park and use of land south of Lake I as an active recreational area.***

Chair Blank asked Mr. Dolan what staff is looking for with this question in terms of input, if staff is asking for comments versus something else.

Mr. Dolan replied that what staff is trying to get from the Planning Commission is its feelings about the location and kinds of parks. He noted that all the plans show this area as being a community park, an open space type of passive use type of facility, with potential extensions out into the habitat area as there would not be any development within any of the Cope Lake area as far as flood concerns go.

Chair Blank stated that if it is the only alternative, then the feedback from him is that it looks great.

Mr. Dolan stated that that it is what staff is looking for, just some kind of concurrence because staff is pinning down major things now in the plan, and as they do and get confidence, then it narrows the planning options and makes it easier.

Chair Blank stated that it cannot go north because of the APA.

Mr. Dolan replied that it could with residential. He indicated that this area is one which staff is looking for concurrence on as they have heard a lot of people say they would like a passive park with trails and leisure facilities, and others say they would like an active park with recreation facilities. He added that there could also be, in some cases, a neighborhood or village green of a couple of acres for people to gather at, and then the question later on, a fourth potential park, that would be for the City to share a neighborhood park with the School District as a park and the school play area.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Rasmussen to describe an active park versus a passive park. He indicated that he thinks he understands a passive park as having walkways and observation areas and that kind of thing and inquired if by active park, he is talking about a swim center or basketball courts with a playground, or something else.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the kind of uses that the Parks and Recreation Commission suggested and felt strongly about included a three- to four- acre dog park, and there was a discussion about tennis courts and a swimming pool, and then neighborhood facilities for the people in that area.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if that would be open to all residents, including the residents west of the development area.

Mr. Rasmussen said yes; there would be public parks and private open space. He added that in this case, the entryway and detention basin would be a major buffer and a private play area essentially to keep residential development away from the Transfer Station. He added that the spine discussed earlier would be private and access horizontally over toward Cope Lake for the drainage swales would also be private.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he is in favor of everything Mr. Rasmussen described.

Commissioner Posson inquired if an HOA would have to be developed for private parks that would be just for the residents.

Mr. Rasmussen said yes.

Commissioner Olson agreed and stated that he is captivated with Commission O'Connor's great idea to put some higher-density in position to have a view of the lake. He added that he does not have any issue with that major park east of El Charro Road.

Chair Blank agreed that it is a great idea but added that the only problem with this is that it puts the higher-density right up against the neighborhood because of the APA, which is restrictive in terms of what can be done there. He added that he likes the parks.

Commissioner Pearce agreed, especially with an active park, given the real limited use of what can be done with the lakes.

Commissioner Olson added that a park for dogs would be great.

6. ***Comment on extending Boulder Street into or through the EPSP area to reduce traffic on Busch Road.***

Chair Blank asked Mr. Rasmussen what staff is looking for here.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that this is sort of a check-in type question as well, as far as a way to get traffic out of and into the Specific Plan area from the west without having to put it all on Busch Road. He indicated that this discussion really had not taken place to any significant extent until the Specific Plan process started up and, therefore, may be something new to some of the Commissioners.

Chair Blank requested Mr. Rasmussen to put up the slide showing the Boulder Street extension.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that Boulder Street is a new road and does not have major plan implications. He stated that there are several different plans: on one of the plans, it extends right down and connects to Busch Road, and another, it goes all the way

through to El Charro Road. He added that staff wants to know if the Commission has any concerns about the extension.

Mr. Dolan stated that it is more about "yes," "no," or "connect Boulder Street," as opposed to "I like it looping in one particular spot."

Chair Blank inquired if the Commission should make any comments with respect to its aesthetics.

Mr. Dolan replied that the Commission may, if it desires.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if there have been any traffic analysis done on the extra road where it improves the flow.

Mr. Dolan replied that staff has not done anything near what is going to be done. He noted that Mike Tassano has been doing this long enough, and staff has opinions that that is what it is going to do.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he thinks this will give more options to disperse the traffic.

Mr. Dolan replied that was correct.

Chair Blank stated that he does not have any objections with having that road go through but would want to see the traffic study.

Commissioner Posson stated that he thinks the traffic study will make the determination but that he thinks it should be included in the evaluation. He noted that alignment has been his question about the grid system, that it should provide an optimization for the maximum use of the land and also try to approximate the property lines to the greatest extent possible to make it easier for the developers.
Commissioner Olson indicated that he is in favor of that connection.

Commissioner Pearce said yes; it helps the circulation.

7. ***Comment on site planning priorities regarding Smart Growth, sustainability, and Climate Action Plan objectives.***

Chair Blank asked what staff is looking for here and if the Commission is supposed to rank Smart Growth, sustainability, and Climate Action Plan objectives. He noted that priorities usually means there is a list of things, and these all sound very closely related.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that staff is interested in any creative thoughts the Commission might have with regard to these, whether there is anything that should be included in the plan or something that might be violating these principles. He noted that these have

been very important topics to the City over the last ten years and are described pretty thoroughly in the General Plan.

Mr. Dolan stated that he was going to give some food for thought: one of the things that is throughout those themes in the General Plan is walkability, and there are all kinds of opportunities here for connectivity between the components. He noted that the clustering of high-density uses together contributes to walkability, but there seems to be less of an interest in that.

Commissioner Posson stated that he cannot give any specifics and thinks that all those aspects should be looked at and kept in mind when the larger land use element is considered: things like walkability, connection of the trails, and parks such that they are adjacent to the neighborhood to allow for maximum use.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that the one thing about Smart Growth is how it is going to be developed and there will be different ownership out there. He indicated that he would like to see some infrastructure built, and that it would be nice to finish off the road and get the traffic, at least through El Charro Road; but he does not know the mechanism of how to get multiple acres with multiple developers to contribute to a roadway in advance of developing the land.

Mr. Dolan commented that this is definitely a major challenge and made even more complicated by the fact that Growth Management will be applied with only an annual allotment of homes being built.

Chair Blank stated that for him, Smart Growth, sustainability, and Climate Action Plan objectives are all very important. He indicated that he is very optimistic and would like to make sure, as the planning process goes through, to incorporate bike trails as well as pre-wiring and public parking to accommodate electric vehicles, which he really believes are going to become more and more common over time, especially in the urban areas. He noted that the City has done a lot of work but he thinks it needs to look further out to see what is coming down that horizon.

Commissioner Pearce agreed. She indicated that she has already spoken to the walkability aspect and thinks the Task Force is doing a good job in taking these kinds of things into account.

Commissioner Olson indicated that he is all for Smart Growth and sustainability.

8. Comment on planning potential school sites in conjunction with City parks.

Mr. Rasmussen noted that this is a topic that has been coming up repeatedly lately and staff wanted to check in with the Commission on that. He indicated that an example is Mohr Elementary School, where it did develop in that way.

Chair Blank commented that it seems kind of an odd question that someone would say "No, don't put a school near a park."

Mr. Rasmussen replied that this is a situation where there are a lot of parks, a lot of park acreage, and a lot of park maintenance in the plan, with the community park, the sports facility, a neighborhood school park, and a village green, so there may have to be some tradeoffs in the future as far as the kinds of parks.

Commissioner Olson stated that if there has to be a school put in there, it would probably be a good idea to put a park next to it.

Commissioner Posson agreed with Commission Olson, adding that he does not know why a school would not be put near a park.

Mr. Dolan stated that the City has been accused of being too park-heavy; there is a lot of park, which is expensive to build and even more expensive to operate.

Chair Blank noted that it does not mean build a park for the school, but if there is a place where there is going to be a park, then the park could be put next to the school, or the school next to the park. He added that if ten million dollars would be spent to build a special park just for the school, then this should be reconsidered.

Mr. Dolan stated that some of the options for a school site are not necessarily right next to park options and so it would be an extra park.

Commissioner Posson stated that he would modify his comment to say that depending on what the actual layout is, if it is within an economically reasonable thing to do, then it should be done; but if it is going to cost ten million dollars, then it should not be done.

Commissioner Olson agreed.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if staff is saying that the school site might be smaller because the City can utilize part of the school site as a public park, or that the City would share those sites so the school could use the public park for part of its recreation needs.

Mr. Dolan replied that that is probably the case but that this has not been worked out completely:

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he thinks all of the Alternatives are pretty close to some type of park, although Alternative 1 is more of a linear park, and the rest seem to be near one or two parks.

Commissioner Posson stated that he thinks the Commission should look at where there will be the best utilization of the land: if there is a school site and it makes sense from a

development standpoint to have a park there, then that would be terrific and the best way to utilize the land.

Commissioner Pearce stated that her children have gone to Walnut Grove Elementary that has a park next to the school, and it is a really good use of the park: it is a park for the City all the time, and the school uses it as an extension of its facility during school hours. She indicated that if at all possible, it should be done that way.

9. Others

Chair Blank asked the Commissioners if they had any opinions on whether the PGS Transfer Station and the OSC should be moved.

Commissioner Posson stated that he thinks it can be accommodated and seems to be the most reasonable land use because those areas would be taken. He indicated that he probably feels more strongly about the Transfer Station moving just because of the odor and noise, and he does not feel as strongly about moving the OSC. He added that from an efficiency standpoint, he senses that the OSC could be more centrally located, although that is probably improbable based on utilization of land across the City, and that more currently is a probably reasonable location.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed with Commissioner Posson that he is not as focused on the OSC as with moving the Transfer Station out of the residential area. He noted that he thinks it needs to go at least to the perimeter of El Charro Road or on the other side. With respect to the OSC, he indicated that he knows there has been some recent renovations; he does not know how many dollars were put in there, but he would hate to throw that away if major work was done over there. He added that he is fine with where it is if not a lot of dollars were invested there, but he is also fine with moving it as well.

Chair Blank stated that he does not think the OSC poses the same types of problems as the Transfer Station does, and he is really concerned about moving the Transfer Station from a dollar amount and that if it will be moved, it absolutely has to be at zero cost to the ratepayers, taxpayers, and everybody else. He added that he has no idea if that is going to be an EPA mega site when they start taking that thing apart and seeing what is in there. With respect to the OSC, he stated that the citizens of Pleasanton should not be charged for the move.

Commissioner Olson stated that he would leave the OSC where it is and would definitely move the Transfer Station, but it would need to be done without undue burden on the ratepayers. He noted that in his opinion, his garbage rates are not outlandish, and what he pays to have his garbage picked up is a terrific bargain, so some limited rate adjustment would not bother him.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she certainly thinks moving the Transfer Station is more important than moving the OSC. She noted that the Task Force has been pretty adamant that this should be done at no costs to the City or to the ratepayers, and that

the property owners who are going to develop this property need to figure out a way to make that happen without passing those costs on.

Chair Blank asked staff if they got what they needed from the Commission.

Mr. Dolan said yes and thanked the Commission.

P13-1858, City of Pleasanton, East Pleasanton Specific Plan
Project update and discussion of four working draft specific plan alternatives for an approximately 1,100 acre area east of Martin Avenue and Valley Avenue, north of Stanley Boulevard, and south of Arroyo Mocho. Zoning for the approximately 235 acres of this property that is within the City of Pleasanton is P (Public and Institutional) and I-G-40 (General Industrial, 40,000 square foot minimum lot size).

Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development, presented the staff report and explained why this item is on the Agenda again. He stated that at the last meeting, staff gave the Commission a status report on what the Task Force has being doing, the input staff has received from all the other Commissions and interested parties, and where the Task Force was headed as it geared up for a check-in with the City Council. He indicated that staff listened to the Commission's feedback, which included some great feedback and some actual substantive policy direction. He noted that staff did not necessarily absorb this feedback or respond to it during the meeting, and at a later discussion on the Commission's input, staff felt there were some things they wanted to circle back on with the Commission because they felt these were very important. He stated that this primarily relates to the theme that has gotten a fair amount of play at the Task Force and was really picked up on and reinforced by the Planning Commission: the idea that future development in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area should be reflective mathematically in terms of the mix of single-family versus multi-family, similar to the rest of town, which is currently 75-percent single-family detached and 25-percent multi-family. He indicated that this is definitely possible and makes some sense, particularly in maintaining the character of the community, and is completely understandable that some would want to entertain this with respect to a whole new 400 acres to develop.

Mr. Dolan stated that there were a few things staff wanted to double-check on with the Commission. He then displayed two tables on the screen:

Estimate of RHNA to Year 2030 and Acreage
[redacted]ed to Accommodate Housing Needs

	2014-2022 RHNA	Estimated 2014 Inventory	Additional units to be planned for 2014-2022 RHNA	Estimate of 2022-2030 RHNA	Estimate of units to be planned for 2014-2030	Additional Acreage Needed
Very Low Income	1,102	991	111	1,102	1,213	40
Low Income						
Moderate Income	405	0	405	405	810	35
Above Moderate Income	551	270	281	551	832	111
Total	2,058	1,261	797	2,058	2,855	186

Mr. Dolan explained that this first table is a review of the time frame in terms of housing that the Task Force is thinking about planning for. He pointed out that it goes through the math of what is left over from the last round and what the City is faced with in the next round of RHNA, and what is being assumed for the round after that. He noted that the City does not know what that assignment is going to be in the round following that, but staff is assuming that it is going to be pretty much the same as the first one because that is the only piece of data staff has to go on, although it could be higher or it could be lower.

Mix of Single Family and Multifamily Units and Comparison to RHNA

	Total Units	Number of Single Family Units in Alternative	Number of Multi-family Units in Alternative	Multi-family Units as a Percent of low, very-low and moderate income RHNA requirement	Number of Single Family at 75%	Number of Multi-family at 25%	25 % Multi-family as a Percent of estimated RHNA for Very-low, Low and Moderate	Number of multi-family units which would need to be located elsewhere in City
Alternative 1	1,000	500	500	29%	750	250	12%	1,773
Alternative 2	1,426	465	961	48%	1,070	357	16%	1,686
Alternative 3	1,710	486	1,224	61%	1,283	428	21%	1,595
Alternative 4	1,283	641	643	32%	962	321	16%	1,782

Mr. Dolan stated that his main point is made primarily by this second table which shows the four Alternatives that were presented to the Commission at the last meeting:

- The first column shows a wide range of unit totals starting with 1,000; 1,426; 1,710; and 1,283.

- The second and third columns show the breakdown in terms of how many of those in the various Alternatives are single-family and how many are multi-family, which vary quite a bit.

- The fourth column shows the percent of the multi-family units for low, very-low, and moderate income RHNA requirement and how much of the requirement would be addressed in each of those Alternatives.

  Mr. Dolan stated that this includes two RHNA cycles and shows how much of the RHNA requirement for low, very-low, and moderate multi-family units would be accommodated in the plan area if those Alternatives were adopted just how they were. He pointed out that these Alternatives range from 25 percent up to 61 percent. He noted that there has been a fair amount of discussion about how this is a wide open area and there is no other comparable place in town, and

about what is the appropriate percentage of the City's future RHNA to place in this quadrant. He indicated that it is a legitimate question, and most people have been mindful of the Council's previous policy discussion that the City will not put all these units there and would like to achieve some sort of a balance.

The next two columns get to the direction that staff received from the Planning Commission that, based on a 75-percent single-family and 25-percent multi-family, Alternative 1 with 1,000 units would result in a split of 750/250; the breakdown for the other Alternatives are shown when applied to 1,426 units for Alternative 2; 1,710 units for Alternative 3; 1,283 units for Alternative 4.

- The last two columns show that if the range of numbers of units are somewhere in the vicinity of 1,000 units up to 1,700 units – and the Task Force, at its last meeting, actually added a couple of alternatives that creep up a little bit above those numbers but not too much – then the City is only going to accommodate somewhere in the range of 12 percent to 21 percent of the multi-family requirements over the next two RHNA periods in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area, thus leaving a demand of anywhere between approximately 1,600 units to almost 1,800 units for which other sites would have to be designated elsewhere in the City.

Mr. Dolan recalled for those among the Commissioners who went through the last Housing Element process that this was not an easy task. He noted that there were a few sites that scored really well in the ratings process that did not get selected, with two of the best ones actually being in the East side. He indicated that there was a lot of discussion about the Kiewit property and the Legacy property at that time, but these did not make the list and were going to be saved for the next time around. He added that there was also the Irby property, which scored really well but did not make the final cut.

Mr. Dolan continued that after these sites, the City will be looking at new sites that have not really been talked about before. He indicated that this can be done but noted that staff did not really take the next step and explore the implications of the Planning Commission's direction, and would like to circle back to the Commission, before it checks-in with the City Council next week, and see if the Commission had any additional comments based on this information.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Dolan how many acres were rezoned last time to meet the RHNA numbers.

Mr. Dolan replied that there were 70 acres.

Commissioner O'Connor commented that with these numbers, the City would be looking at about 60 acres, in the 1,800-unit range at 30 units to the acre, which is pretty close to the same amount as last time.

Mr. Dolan noted that was correct.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that what he finds interesting about this calculation is that even with the highest development, Alternative 3, which got most of the criticism at the last meeting, it would be off only by about less than 200 units, which is really not a lot of difference. He noted that all four Alternatives are pretty close in terms of what would need to be found in the rest of the City.

Mr. Dolan stated that he understood Commissioner O'Connor's point. He explained that the average is approximately 250 per project, and in chunks of 250, the average would be somewhere around eight acres. He noted that these should be thought of in terms of how many of these projects are really going to be available. He questioned if, for example, one apartment is built on 400 acres of developable land, if it would be necessary to have that few to reflect the character of the rest of the town. He displayed the graphic that staff had prepared for the Housing Element Update that shows where multi-family is concentrated within the City, and replicating that character is not necessarily a mathematical equation. He noted that one can drive up the west side of the City for miles and not see any multi-family development; then driving up into Hacienda and around there, there is a little more, and there are some in the Downtown. He added that the experience varies quite a bit, depending on where one is in town to derive the character based on the type of housing.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that it is interesting that although there is nothing in the East area, it is still being studied. He further noted that there is not a lot that have been rezoned before that is even close to that area.

Mr. Dolan noted that was correct. He indicated that there has been a fair amount of comment, and if the quadrant defined as East/West is split by Santa Rita Road and North/South is split by Stanley Boulevard, there is not a lot in there. He stated that it has been pointed out by Task Force members and even by a previous Councilmember that the Auf der Maur site, which will be coming before the Commission in the near future, is pretty close; and then the Irby property will come forward in the next round and rates very highly for consideration, which is not too far away either.

Mr. Dolan emphasized that his point remains that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area is the only wide-open space that the City has left. He indicated that Commissioner O'Connor's point that the differences are not that much is a good one; however, it is something that the City needs to be sensitive to when considering how many apartment projects of this size can be put out there and still maintain the character so it still feels like the rest of Pleasanton. He reiterated that he just wants the Commission to have another chance to absorb that information and see if there was anything else it wanted to share with the Council.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that something that came up quite a bit at the last meeting was that the Commission realized that it will be necessary to come back to the entire City, but it does not want to necessarily have to come back to the East side after it has been planned. He added that the Commission was thinking that when all the rest

of the numbers come up around the rest of the City, the 25-percent/75-percent mix may have to change, and there was pretty much consensus among the Commissioners that going up to about 35 percent was an acceptable number.

Commissioner Olson agreed.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she did some math on the 35 percent because she was thinking about how it helps considerably in terms of the number of multi-family units. She noted that for Alternative 1, that would be 350 units; Alternative 2 would be 499 units; Alternative 3 would be 599 units; and Alternative 4 would be 449 units. She pointed out that it seems like that is still within the realm of the policy direction that the Commission had recommended but gets more units.

Chair Blank added that it is also reasonably consistent with what the rest of Pleasanton looks like.

Commissioner Pearce agreed totally.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if that was from a low number to a high number.

Commissioner Pearce replied that it is from Alternative 1 to Alternative 4. She added that she is only talking about the number of multi-family units and not about single-family units.

Commissioner Olson stated that he totally agrees that the Commission's consensus at the last meeting was that it was comfortable with 35 percent. He then pointed out that the two or three projects that Mr. Dolan indicated scored quite high at the last round but were not included ought to be considered at this point as the City goes forward. He stated that the numbers should be adjusted to include those projects if it is pretty certain that they are going to go forward, rather than looking at where the City is right now and saying that there is a crisis.

Mr. Dolan stated that there is really only one project that is not acknowledged, and that is the Irby site.

Commissioner Olson noted that then there are two others.

Mr. Dolan stated that there were two sites that were kind of generically identified as Kiewit, a portion of the Kiewit site and not the entire 50-plus acres; and a very small percentage of the Legacy property. He noted that those sites were not picked because the East Pleasanton Specific Plan had not yet been done. He added that it was unclear whether those locations made any sense, and there were some good reasons not to include them.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Ganping Ju stated that he was a member of the Ironwood community and wanted to point out that this community has been supporting some of the City's projects such as those for senior citizens as well as the active Downtown community. He asked the Commission to take that into consideration. He noted that in Alternative 1, the multi-family units are located next to Busch Road and closest to the senior apartments. He asked that these multi-family units be moved farther away from the senior citizens because Seniors are very sensitive to noise. He also requested that Busch Road not be used as a collector road because traffic will become a nightmare. He pointed out that children should also be taken into consideration in relation to the quality of the schools in the area. He added that there should not be more than 1,000 homes in the East Pleasanton area and that there should not be too many single-family units as this will greatly negatively affect the property values of the Ironwood community.

Colleen Winey stated that she was a member of the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force representing the Zone 7 Water Agency, a property owner in the area. She read for the record, the following letter that was sent out earlier today on behalf of the Zone 7 General Manager regarding his comments on the proposed Land Use Alternatives for the East Pleasanton Specific Plan:

> *"Zone 7 Water Agency (Zone 7) has reviewed the referenced proposed Land use Alternatives for the East Pleasanton Specific Plan (EPSP) and we wanted to provide some background and comments consistent with those we have provided to the EPSP Task Force. Zone 7 is interested in the EPSP are because the study area includes three of the future Chain of Lakes that will be owned and operated by Zone 7, Lakes H, I, and Cope. The Chain of Lakes is a series of former quarry pits that are being turned over to Zone 7 by the quarry owners as mining is completed to be used for water management purposes.*
>
> *"In 1981, the Livermore-Amador Valley Quarry Area Reclamation (LAVQAR) Specific Plan was adopted, which established the Chain of Lakes area as mitigation for impacts from the gravel extraction that removed aquifer material and increased salt loading through evaporation of the exposed groundwater. LAVQAR included an associated Environmental Impact Report that provided an analysis of certain water management uses for the lakes.*
>
> *"In addition to LAVQAR, Zone 7's Board adopted the Stream Management Master Plan and associated Master Environmental Impact Report in 2006 that discusses the use of the Chain of Lakes for multiple uses, including flood protection. Some of the other planning documents and agreements that relate to the facilities to be constructed and the uses in and around the Chain of Lakes area include contracts with each of the quarry operators/owners, Zone 7's Well Master Memorandum of Understanding with Dublin San Ramon Services District regarding the storage of recycled water, and the existing agreement for public access along the Lake I Buffer Strip with the City of Pleasanton. Any plans for the Chain of Lakes (and Lakes H, I, and Cope, specifically) must be consistent with all Zone 7's existing Master Plans and agreements.*

"Because the Chain of Lakes plays such a critical role in Zone 7's continuing mission to provide a reliable, high quality water supply and effective regional flood protection for Eastern Alameda County's residents and businesses and because the City of Pleasanton is moving forward to develop the EPSP, staff have created a methodology to systematically evaluate and plan for various opportunities and applications for each lake and the Chain of Lakes as a whole (such as groundwater recharge, peak storm water storage for regional flood protection, seasonal recycled water storage, habitat corridors, education, passive and active recreation, etc.). Zone 7 will accelerate the evaluation of Lakes H, I, and Cope to better coordinate with current City planning efforts such as the EPSP. A preliminary evaluation and status report will be presented to the Zone 7 Board of Directors on Wednesday, June 19, 2013, at the Board's Regular Monthly Meeting which begins at 7 p.m. at the address listed above. The staff report related to that effort should be posted on Zone 7's website by close of business this Friday.

"Zone 7 will continue to collaborate with staff from the City of Pleasanton and advise the City as planning efforts for the lakes within the EPSP area are developed. Please feel free to contact either me (925 454-5000, email jduerig@zone7water.com) or Colleen Winey (925 4544-5063, email at cwiney@zone7water.com), if you have any questions or need additional information.

"Sincerely,

"G.F. Duerig, General Manager"

Sean Sowell stated that one of the things that came up at the last EPSP meeting was information that the large swath of the land in the southeast corner of this Specific Plan area, which was in all four Alternatives, was contemplated to be industrial zoning. He indicated that it may perhaps not even be necessary or desirable to have that land zoned as industrial or for commercial use, given the effect that that will have on the housing and jobs balance, the traffic issues, etc. He noted that this did get some attention and discussion at the Specific Plan meeting, and he would like to bring that to the Commission's attention as well because he thought it may not be advisable to zone that for industrial purposes. He indicated that he recognized that Vulcan Materials Company is right next to it, farther east, but given the fact that the City is having challenges with regard to housing issues, continuing to skew the jobs and housing balance further by not easing up on the commercial and industrial uses of the land would, in a sense, be digging a hole a little bit further. He stated that he does not know if the Planning Commission can or should take a position on that but that this was something Becky Dennis and Citizens for a Caring Community brought to the Task Force's attention. He noted that he had not seen the numbers before, and if they are right, that this might be worth some consideration.

Mr. Sowell stated that another thing that came up that he had not heard before was a presentation by the gentleman that was the owner or spokesperson for Kiewit who brought some figures regarding densities that were not reflected in any of the four existing Alternatives, and which he is calling Alternative 5, although it is not anything official. He recalled that the speaker brought up the possibility of densities in the order of 6 to 12 units along with the 23 and 30 units mix instead of the 3, 4, and 11 mixes that were part of Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4. He asked the Commission to look at that as well and factor that into its thought process. He noted that if there are 5, 6, 8, 10 or 12 units per acre rather than just 3 units, there would be a sea of 3 units per acre and then towers of 23 and 30 units. He indicated that it does not need to be like that, and maybe that kind of variability would be in order. He stated that maybe an Alternative 5 or 6 would make a little more sense, or tweak 1 and 2 to change the 4's and 3's to 6's and 8's and the 8's to 10's or 12's. He noted that Commissioner Pearce ran some numbers, and pointed out that this has the effect of giving everybody a little more wiggle room, not only in this particular part of town but in the rest of town.

Mr. Sowell stated that a third thing he wanted to bring up, which he mentioned at the Task Force meeting, is that at the very beginning of the Task Force process, the City Council did an end-run around the Task Force by ruling out in the top corner, which is just inside the Airport Protection Area, the existence of any housing and instead putting campus office in there. He noted that this goes back to the industrial/commercial use in the southeast corner and that it may not make sense to have that zoned that way as well.

Mary Switzer stated that she has lived in town for 41 years and has watched it grow. She indicated that her biggest concern with respect to East Pleasanton is the traffic. She questioned what the City is going to do about the traffic going down Stanley Boulevard and if Busch Road and Boulder Street will be extended. She noted that right now, when the freeway gets balled up, the people do an end-run around Stanley Boulevard, down First Street or Isabel Avenue and cuts through to I-84. She expressed concern that there is the freeway in and out traffic, and the City is talking about some pretty high densities. She added that putting in apartments means a lot of cars in a small area, and all those cars have to get to the grocery store, to school, and to the Downtown. She stated that she also heard that there is going to be a couple of hundred apartment units on the corner where Bernal Avenue cuts across Stanley Boulevard, and if that is true, the resulting traffic should be considered.

John Jay stated that he lives in southeast Pleasanton and moved here for the character of the City. He indicated that he loved the City back then and was concerned about the direction that it is headed toward today. He stated that the biggest concern that he has is the possibility of crime. He noted that he has been a prosecutor for 35 years, tried murder cases for 15 years and has run offices for about 11 years. He added that he sees patterns, and, unfortunately, one of those patterns is the relationship between low-income housing and crime. He inquired if, at this point, it is beyond requesting some sort of Environmental Impact Report or Economic Impact Report when low-income housing is interjected in other areas. He stated that he heard the

Commission's ratio is 75 to 25 and that it is being increased to 35 and 65. He asked the Commission to be cautious of the impact that is going to occur with the interjection of low-income homes.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Blank noted that the Commission is not being asked to take any specific action other than to provide additional feedback and comments, and commented that usually that is "staff speak" for "We are not really sure you guys knew what you were doing the first time around and want to give you a chance to think about it and make sure."

Mr. Dolan replied that hearing the Commission reiterated that it would go up to 35 percent is actually something that maybe he did not hear clear enough the last time. He stated that he was just looking at the Minutes and noted that it was said a few times, but it did not seem like the theme. He added that a reassurance that the Commission would go that far is something that is useful to staff.

Chair Blank asked staff if they have what they need.

Mr. Dolan said yes, unless the Commission would consider going beyond that.

Commissioner Posson asked staff, if the City goes with 35 percent of multi-family in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area and then accommodate the remaining 2030 RHNA needs across the City, where that would bring the mix of single-family and multi-family across the City, if it would be 32 percent or 28 percent or 26 percent.

Mr. Dolan replied that staff has not taken the time to run the answer. He noted that it is a simple calculation but that he could not tell what it would be.

Commissioner Posson stated that the reason he is asking that question is because the Commission has heard a lot tonight and at the last public hearing about making sure there is an equitable distribution of these requirements across the City. He noted that the Commission came up with 35 percent, which he felt was reasonable because a new area is being planned, and the RHNA numbers are coming. He stated that in his view, the City should have some additional accommodation for additional multi-family housing in this area, and if this is going to be equitable, then it might make sense to at least run that calculation, and if it comes out to be 28 percent or 40 percent – his guess is it is probably somewhere between 25 percent and 35 percent – or what that new number might be, taking into consideration the 2030 RHNA needs, then that should be the allocation for the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area.

Chair Blank stated that his understanding was basically, staff stated the last time that the Pleasanton current ratio is 75 percent to 25 percent, and the Commission is willing to go up to 35 percent/65 percent if it made sense. He indicated that he was trying to understand what numbers Commissioner Posson wanted to run and asked if it was with the general mix if the City did 35 percent in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan.

Commissioner Posson replied that what he is suggesting is considering the estimated 2030 RHNA numbers and based on the housing across the City, including the East Pleasanton Specific Plan, whatever that percentage is should be the percentage of RHNA allocation, accommodated by the East Pleasanton Specific Plan. He indicated that the reason he was asking is if it is 35 percent in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan, and then the rest was distributed across the City, and then, the City's allocation of multi-family to single-family is 28 percent, then the mix should be 28 percent/72 percent.

Chair Blank noted that it would certainly be the number staff should run before it goes up to the City Council.

Commissioner Posson noted that it would then be an equitable distribution across the community.

Chair Blank and Commissioner Olson agreed.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he might be fine with that, depending on what those numbers looked like, and he might even be fine with going up. He added that if they were close, he would not have a problem with the East side having one or two extra percentage points because that it is a new area, so people moving into that area are going to know what that has been zoned. He continued that on the other hand, going back and rezoning older, developed part of the City and adding lots of apartment buildings next to existing residential communities that have been there for 20 or 30 years, would impact the people in these neighborhoods who do not have much choice as they are already there. He then asked if the School Board has ever looked at this 30-to-the-acre type of development and figured out how many students are expected to come out of that. He noted that there are not that many three-bedroom homes so not a lot of families will be moving in, maybe single parents with one child or two children.

Mr. Dolan replied that the School District has a number that it has been using which is created by its consulting demographer. He noted that because the City does not have any of these new apartments built at this density that the School District could sample, the District is using data from existing apartments and comparing them to what the yield is in Dublin and places close by. He stated that there is no perfect match and noted that the yield is not high but there is a fair amount of units. He added that the District did its study a few years ago, right before the City knew for sure that it was going to be losing the housing cap.

Commissioner O'Connor recalled that the District came up with a number that was somewhat less than one child per unit, on average, like a .8 or .7.

Mr. Dolan replied that he does not remember what the number is but it was pretty small, definitely less than one child per unit.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that if there were 300 units total in one area, at .7 or .8 child per unit, that would be 250 children or so.

Commissioner Posson indicated that he did not make the comment on the 6th paragraph on page 2 regarding missing the treats and requested that it be corrected.

Mr. Dolan stated that all of this would be spelled out in the Environmental Impact Report, and it would include traffic and all those things that were mentioned. In response to Chair Blank's question, he said that staff has what they need.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she thinks what the Commission is saying is that it is flexible, that it does not want to be dramatically different from the rest of the town but recognizes the need for units there.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired how many total acres the City has right now and how many units it has, not counting East Pleasanton.

Mr. Dolan replied that there are somewhere between 26,000 and 27,000 units in the City.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired how many acres there are in the City when considering adding density to this 400-acre area.

Ms. Stern replied that one would have to really look at it as what is the area that is designated residential. She asked Commissioner O'Connor if he is asking about vacant areas in the City.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that the City is planning more than just residential in the East side; it is also looking at some industrial and some retail. He indicated that talking about these numbers, he is hearing people say how they do not want that much density. He asked what the density per acre is in the whole City; how many acres were developed and how many homes there are.

Chair Blank noted that at that large a scale, it is almost averaging an average because there are such varying densities. He further noted that he is not sure how meaningful it would be to get the average density in the City of Pleasanton.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that it means that if an area as big as 400 acres or 500 acres is being developed, then it would show know what the rest of the City has in terms of how many housing units there are in that area. He added that he thinks it would tell him if 1,000 units really was the max the City wants to go, or if it is really more like the 1,700. He stated that he thinks he knows what he would like to see, but he does not know what the whole City build-out today really is.

Chair Blank stated that some questions need to be considered, such as if people who have entitlement rights to build but have not built yet are counted, or there are some

high density housing that are already approved but has not yet built. He noted that it might be worth looking at.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that it is "built plus approved" because what the build-out is going to be here is already known. He added that this is planning for a new area so it should consider "built plus zoned," what the actual build-out would be.

Mr. Dolan stated that he thinks staff could come up with some metrics to make a comparison to the rest of the City; however, the average density would be a bit problematic as there are certain considerations, for example, the lakes throw everything off.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that lakes are not a developable area; what is being considered here is the 400 acres.

Mr. Dolan stated that if Commissioner O'Connor is referring to growth for the City, then that is a different number.

Chair Blank stated that a way to do a weighted average needs to be figured out because there are going to be other areas where there is developable and non-developable acreage.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she thinks there are a lot of ways to show whether or not this is compatible with the rest of the City.

Mr. Dolan stated that staff will be keeping that in mind to provide different measure points in addition to just the percentage of multi-family versus single-family.

Commissioner Pearce noted that that would be helpful.

Chair Blank stated that he does not mean to summarize the Commission, but he thinks that Commission has a strong sense that it wants East Pleasanton to be compatible with the rest of the community and not be different or an outlier.

Commissioner Olson asked Mr. Dolan, given that RHNA allocations are not established to begin with, why the City would not include preliminary numbers from the Kiewit project and factor those into staff's analysis.

Mr. Dolan replied that Kiewit is included in the analysis because they will be numbers that are included in the East Side Specific Plan. He indicated that Kiewit will be developed if Alternative 1 is picked; some percentage of that 1,000 units will be on Kiewit property.

Commissioner Posson noted that there were a couple questions from the speakers.

Chair Blank stated that one of the speakers was looking for an Environmental Impact Report, and staff has indicated that one will be done. He noted that when that occurs, the public will get a chance to weigh in on what should or should not be included in the Report.

Ms. Harryman noted that there was a question about the Auf der Maur property on Stanley Boulevard and Bernal Avenue.

Commissioner Posson stated that to find out about what is going on at Stanley Boulevard and Bernal Avenue, contact staff.

Mr. Dolan indicated that that project will be on the Agenda for the July 10, 2013 meeting.

23. Update and discussion of four working draft Specific Plan alternatives for the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area, an approximately 1,100-acres east of Martin Avenue and Valley Avenue, north of Stanley Boulevard, and south of the Arroyo Mocho

Mayor Thorne introduced the item, noting that this is an only an opportunity for the Council to receive information and provide input; no action will be taken.

Community Development Director Dolan presented the staff report, calling out the following assumptions on which the task force reached consensus and is now requesting feedback:

- Any development in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan (EPSP) are would bear its own cost of infrastructure and not burden other portions of the city or City government;
- Extension of El Charro Road would continue all the way from I-580 South to Stanley Boulevard;
- The plan may consider development beyond the current Urban Growth Boundary;
- Relocation of Pleasanton Garbage Service and the City's Operations Service Center is ideal if it can be accomplished in a cost neutral manner;
- The plan shall include a public school site until such time as the schoo board completes its demographic studies and provides further direction;
- Both Busch Road and Boulder Street will contain connections through to E Charro Road;
- The plan should accommodate more than one cycle, ideally two cycles, of Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers;
- The main roadway system would be comprised of curvilinear streets as opposed to a rigid grid system

In addition to the number of RHNA cycles to be accommodated by the plan, there was considerable discussion related to what percentage of these cycles should be accounted for in the planning area and what the appropriate mix of single family versus multi-family units would be. Mr. Dolan explained that approximately 400 of the 1,100 acres is developable land. He also explained that the RHNA assignments contain a substantial number of units that must be developed at 30 units per acre and, while this acreage can accommodate that kind of density, there is the potential to build the area out such that it has a different character from the rest of town. The task force has therefore been very mindful of the issue of balance and the town's current balance of 75% single family to 25% multi-family development. He noted that the recent rezoning and project approvals do indicate a somewhat significant change from those numbers to 66% single family and 34% multi-family.

The task force has also requested the Council's feedback about whether to concentrate the density around a community center or disperse it through to the edges of the planning area. While the task force currently prefers to disperse it, staff has been attempting to follow traditional urban design principles that place the greatest intensity in the center where community serving uses can be better concentrated.

Vice-Mayor Cook-Kallio said there has been some new thought about how to best locate density in urban design and asked and confirmed that staff had not conducted outreach to see what other alternatives might be viable.

Mr. Dolan introduced the 6 circulation and land use plan alternatives currently under consideration, noting that additional dialogue at the last task force meeting brought about the last 2 options. Staff is requesting the Council's feedback on these options so that the task force can narrow the list to 3 or 4 alternatives on which to focus further analysis. He noted key planning area constraints, which include 700 acres in and around the lake area that is not available for development, the existing Urban Growth Boundary that essentially runs in alignment with the anticipated extension of El Charro Road, the City limit, and Airport Protection Zone. In presenting the following alternatives, he noted that the purpose of the exercise is not to analyze the physical arrangement of land use patterns but rather to make sure the alternatives capture the full range of alternatives that could result in a well laid out community with the appropriate mix of units and density.

Councilmember Brown noted that Cope Lake changes significantly in size from one map to another. Mr. Dolan clarified that the change relates only to water levels that may have been present at the time the map was prepared. He explained that regardless of its size or condition, the lake is entirely under the control of Zone 7 and is to be used for flood control and open space purposes, not development.

Mayor Thorne asked whether staff has looked at what phasing the extension of El Charro Road to Busch Road would mean to traffic at major intersections along Valley Avenue.

Mr. Dolan said that a completed circulation system through to Stanley would allow traffic to flow more freely from other parts of town. Without that connection to Stanley, a significant portion of that benefit would certainly be lost.

Mayor Thorne said there have been a number of questions about taking the issue of moving the Urban Growth Boundary to the voters and asked at what point in the process a decision on that would be appropriate.

Mr. Dolan said it would be premature to make any decision before identifying the preferred plan alternative.

City Manager Fialho added that the City established a precedent in this regard when it adopted the Bernal Property Specific Plan, subject to approval by the voters. He suggested that if the Council chose to go to the voters regarding the boundary, it could do in the same manner so that all environmental work and other documentation would be completed and available for public review. The specific plan would not become implemented unless there was ratification by the voters to address the Urban Growth Boundary.

Councilmember Brown asked how many developable acres are situated outside the current boundary.

Mr. Dolan estimated a little over 100 acres.

Councilmember Brown said she spoke with a property owner who indicated that Cope Lake alone is 250 acres. When including the 350 acres below, there is a significant difference between that and staff's numbers. Mr. Dolan reiterated that Cope Lake is open space.

Mr. Dolan presented the following land use alternatives:

Alternative 1 provides the least number of residential units; it accommodates 35% of total RHNA over two cycles and has a 50/50 split of single and multi-family development. Like most of the alternatives, residential development is located west of the El Charro extension with industrial use concentrated more towards the eastern side and a potential school site located in the middle of the residential area. Multi-family development is dispersed throughout the planning area and not around an urban center, with two locations of higher density designation (23 and 30 units per acre). All but one alternative include relocation of the OSC and PGS and all alternatives include a campus-office designation with park area in the northeastern portion of the plan area.

Vice-Mayor Cook-Kallio asked and Mr. Dolan confirmed that in this instance, 35% refers to the total RHNA allocation and not just the low, very low and moderate income units the Council and public are used to discussing.

Councilmember Narum also had questions regarding the percentage of RHNA that stemmed from looking at the total allocation versus just lower income. Mr. Dolan provided clarification.

Alternative 2 accommodates 50% of total RHNA over two cycles, with a 33/67 split of single versus multi-family, and focuses multi-family development in a central location. The land use pattern is similar to Alternative 1 with exception of the location of density.

Alternative 3 accommodates 60% of total RHNA over two cycles with a total of 1,700 units and a 28/72 split of single versus multi-family. The land use pattern is similar again except that multi-family development in this alternative is located south of Busch Road.

Councilmember Brown asked Mr. Dolan to demonstrate on the map active mining areas that could potentially affect nearby residential development.

Mr. Dolan noted that active mining sites are primarily located to the east nearest to industrial development.

Alternative 4 is the only alternative that anticipates no change to the current placement of the OSC and PGS. It accommodates 45% of total RHNA over the next two cycles, has an even split of single and multi-family units and disperses the latter throughout the plan area. This alternative has the most industrial development, which extends significantly further west to the edge of the PGS transfer station, and locates the school site east of El Charro Road.

Alternative 5 at its last meeting, the task force had more detailed discussion about the idea of trying to maintain the mix of units represented throughout the rest of town. They recognized that in order to do so, the overall number of units may have to be increased. Alternative 4 calls for 1,750 total units; it accommodates 62% of RHNA for the next two cycles, and has a 60/40 split of single to multi-family residential. This called for a reduction in the amount of industrial use, specifically retail located along the El Charro/Busch Road interchange. The City's economic consultant has advised that retail in this area is going to be more neighborhood-serving in nature and would likely never take off into a larger scale retail effort.

Alternative 6 contains the greatest number of units (2,279), with a significant portion of that medium density single family detached residential development, but does maintain the type of unit mix seen throughout the rest of town. Staff and the task force acknowledge that this is more of an aggressive option for the purposes of worst case scenario EIR analysis.

Retail and office uses are modest and public park acreage is fairly consistent in each alternative. Industrial use ranges from roughly 1.1 to 2.2 million square feet.

Councilmember Narum noted that some alternatives call for an almost comparable amount of private and public open space acreage and asked what was behind this.

Mr. Dolan explained that it is really a matter of the type of space and whether it is anticipated to be a function of the Parks and Recreation Department or the responsibility of the developer.

Councilmember Narum asked whether the proposed volume of industrial space is appropriate given the lower market rates and number of vacancies seen in Livermore.

Mr. Dolan explained that the property owners expressed a distinct interest in industrial use. The economic study acknowledges that this is likely a longer term venture but given the need for buffers between certain land uses and the land use constraints in certain areas, it seems to be viable. He noted that recent studies associated with the General Plan also indicate that industrial development is not necessarily unwise in the long term.

Councilmember Brown asked whether PGS has an interest in moving its transfer station.

Mr. Dolan said PGS likely recognizes that being located in the middle of a residential neighborhood is not in anyone's best interests but that it certainly does come down to financial feasibility.

Mayor Thorne noted that relocation of the OSC would require that the fire tower and several other cost intensive structures be rebuilt as well. He wondered whether it would be more cost effective to look into onsite or adjacent mitigation efforts.

Mr. Dolan acknowledged the point and said that in looking at both this and PGS, everyone agrees that relocating the latter is a much higher priority.

Mayor Thorne opened the item for public comment.

Colleen Winey, Zone 7 Water Agency and task force member, read a letter submitted by Zone 7's General Manager to the Planning Commission. In summary, the letter expressed Zone 7's interest in the EPSP area because of the involvement of Lakes H, I and Cope and noted that any plan for the Chain of Lakes must be consistent with all existing Zone 7 master plans and agreements. As part of Zone 7's continuing mission to provide reliable high quality water supply and effective regional flood protection, its staff has created a methodology to systematically evaluate and plan for various opportunities and applications for each lake and the area as a whole. To better coordinate with the City's current planning effort, Zone 7 has accelerated the evaluation of Lakes H, I and Cope and will present a preliminary evaluation and status report to the Zone 7 Board of Directors on June 19, 2013.

Becky Dennis offered to answer any questions regarding the letter she submitted to the Council. She asked the Council to include affordability in its consideration. She said she has reached the conclusion the best option for meeting affordable workforce housing demands is in areas with existing infrastructure rather than sites such as this. She cautioned that the retail and industrial components of each alternative only increase, rather than address, workforce housing needs and suggested that property owners be asked to consider what a self-mitigating development might look like. She said she did not believe that any of the alternatives provided are workable in terms of making a real contribution to the overall needs of the city.

Julie Testa said she felt strongly that new development should pay for itself. She read from the City's General Plan, noting that every Pleasanton school exceeds the enrollment targets stated within the General Plan as well as the maximum enrollment recommendations published by the California Department of Education. The cited a 2011 report by Pleasanton Unified School District which identifies that the district lacks sufficient capacity to house students created by future development. The district also has $27 million in facilities' debt that it cannot repay. With the knowledge that there is no space in Pleasanton schools nor a plan or the ability to build new schools to mitigate new growth, the City Council violates the General Plan with every unit it approves. She asked the Council to consider a new alternative in which the EPSP area would be developed with all senior housing, thereby avoiding any impacts to schools.

Mary Switzer asked staff to define low and very low income relative to Pleasanton. She said she would hate to see East Pleasanton become a dumping ground for high density development and asked whether any other areas of Pleasanton, such as Hacienda or Stoneridge, were considered as alternative locations to meet the needs of the next two RHNA cycles. She cited strong concerns about traffic, confirmed that the idea is for development to pay for needed infrastructure in a way that makes it cost neutral to the City, and noted that while more houses make the infrastructure more affordable they also increase the impacts.

Mayor Thorne asked staff to follow up with Ms. Switzer regarding her questions.

Carol Cohen stated that the proposed alternatives adversely impact traffic, schools, fire, police, and utilities and burden east Pleasanton with an excessively high percentage of RHNA units. She asked that the task force develop additional proposals that reduce the total number of units, percentage of RHNA units and distribute the impacts of this new development across all areas of Pleasanton.

Sandi Farrell, Ironwood Homeowners' Association President, encouraged the Council to revisit its previous commitment to spread low-income high-density housing throughout the city rather than to allocate the majority of RHNA in one area. She strongly urged consideration of Alternative 1 as the most reasonable and fair plan for current residents of the east side.

Heather Liang, Ironwood resident, said she originally supported Alternative 1 due to it proposing the lowest percentage of RHNA units and lowest number of total units. She said she felt that those who shared her position were brushed aside at the recent Planning Commission meeting, with consideration

given only to those in favor of increased density and more units. She recommended that the Council withhold a decision on the EPSP until it acts on the upcoming Housing Element She also asked that staff reassess the distribution of RHNA units across all of Pleasanton.

Blair Wolfinger, Ironwood resident, said he strongly agreed with other speakers. He noted that a constant them in both the EPSP and Housing Element task force meetings has been an equitable distribution of RHNA throughout Pleasanton. He expressed concerns over how to best balance single and multi-family development here and throughout Pleasanton and asked that a Housing Element study occur before making any final decisions on the EPSP.

Ganping Ju said he moved to Pleasanton for the wonderful schools, sense of community and proximity to work. He asked the Council to keep in mind that placing undue burden on the east side will change the very character that drew him to the City in the first place. He said he would like to see a reasonable mix of units that does not exceed 60% multi-family. He noted that Ironwood has a strong and active adult community and suggested the Council consider a more adult focus that would have lesser impacts on schools. He also asked that they look at a modified alternative 1 that moves the higher density housing away from existing neighborhoods.

Kay Ayala expressed concern over what she feels is a rushed process and RHNA driven plan. She said she had a number of questions about Zone 7, schools, roads, and the Urban Growth Boundary and that there appeared to be misunderstanding amongst both developers and the task force regarding which RHNA numbers must be zoned before December 2014. She clarified that it is only the lawsuit related RHNA that must be assigned by that time and asked staff to report on how many units that is.

Mr. Dolan corrected her, explaining that all concerns related to the lawsuit were addressed in the City's last Housing Element. He explained that another Housing Element deadline is approaching, which will require rezoning to accommodate the next round of RHNA, but that this has to do with state law and not the lawsuit. In order to avoid a similar lawsuit and the issue of development by right, it is imperative that the City meet the deadline that is currently set for December 2014.

Councilmember Brown referred to the staff report where it discusses the 2014 estimated inventory and asked staff to confirm that no rezonings are required by December 2014.

Mr. Dolan said "no," directed her attention further across the table being referenced, and said a total of 797 units must be accommodated by December 2014. When Councilmember Brown questioned this explanation, he clarified that the deadline for the 2014-2022 planning period is currently 2014, not 2022. He further explained that the deadline is tied to the date on which the Regional Transportation Plan is adopted. If adopted on time, the deadline will be December 2014. If that action is delayed, local jurisdictions might have several more months.

Mayor Thorne closed the public comment.

BREAK: Mayor Thorne called a brief recess at 9:06 p.m. and reconvened the regular meeting at 9:13 p.m.

Vice-Mayor Cook-Kallio responded to the questions posed by staff as follows:

- New development should support the cost of its infrastructure. She asked that this also take into consideration certain improvements that relate to but might not be immediately within the EPSP area (sections around and between Valley, Stanley and El Charro and bicycle/pedestrian trail connections);
- El Charro Road should be connected to Stanley, preferably not phased in the same manner as the Stoneridge Drive extension;
- It is premature to make any decision on whether to put an amendment to the Urban Growth Boundary before the voters without knowing what that amendment might be;

- She asked that staff look into creative cost-neutral solutions to relocate the PGS site;
- A potential school site should be identified as part of the plan. As a teacher, parent and Chair of the liaison committee with the school district, she said she understands the difficulty in reconciling the state's goals with the available funding. She said that while the number of students they would need to accommodate and therefore what site would ultimately be suitable is still unknown, waiting to identify suitable sites diminishes the city's ability to acquire them;
- Busch Road and Boulder Street should connect through to El Charro;
- RHNA accommodations should be dispersed throughout the city's entire planning area

With regards to RHNA, she said the Housing Element Task Force has consistently expressed a desire to disperse the low and very-low income units throughout the City. She thought that the staff report's varied focus on both total RHNA and the lower income RHNA units could be confusing the discussion for some and suggested that it would be helpful to include a City map that shows the current high density allocations. She asked and staff confirmed that the total RHNA assignment includes both lower income and market rate units. She acknowledged that meeting these RHNA allocations are not always conducive to the type of well-planned community people might otherwise like, but also conceded that they are in large part a result of Pleasanton's vibrant business community like Ms. Dennis alluded to earlier.

Mr. Dolan confirmed that jobs do generate housing need but reminded everyone that industrial uses are not always job intensive.

Vice-Mayor Cook-Kallio said that while she certainly has no desire to make the community less desirable, the fact remains that they must plan for the future. With regards to alternatives, she said Alternative 1, and likely Alternatives 2 and 3 fail to meet the direction given by the Housing Element Task Force and City Council with regards to dispersing high density development throughout the community as a whole. She recognized that a specific plan as a planning document is not necessarily indicative of exactly what the community would look like. She said she would prefer to examine a higher density, with the understanding that it is a worst case scenario only and not the preferred option. She said she favored Alternative 5 at this time and would like to see Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 explored further.

She referred to her earlier comments regarding newer urban design methods that focus on a smaller central park area surrounded by high-density units that feather out to multi-family and single family homes, all with a compact area of 1 square mile. She asked if there are any viable examples of this sort of design on the west coast and whether it has been considered as an option.

Mr. Dolan so it could be viable but that they are not at the step where they would start to address urban forms and mixed uses.

Councilmember Pentin responded to the questions posed by staff as follows:

- He firmly believes that development should bear the cost of infrastructure. He did however express concern over whether that cost would be prohibitive enough to lead to a lawsuit. He requested some sort of nexus study to show what the level of investment would be based on different use and density scenarios;
- El Charro Road should be connected to Stanley, preferably not phased-in the same manner as the Stoneridge Drive extension. He said he would like to see more discussion on traffic impacts and therefore infrastructure needs of the different alternatives;
- He noted that Policies 22.1, 22.2, 22.3, 22.4 and 22.5 of the General Plan all mention that development beyond the Urban Growth Boundary would need to be put to the voters, though Policy 22.6 specifically excludes the east side from that requirement. He assured the public that no one is a pushing an agenda to keep this from the voters and said he would like an opinion from the City Attorney;
- A public school site should be identified, though it does little to address existing impacts. He said he would like the school district to weigh in on any plan that ultimately comes forward;

- He supported curvilinear street design;
- He could envision and in fact would prefer the OSC to remain in its current location but feels than any alternative should address the relocation of PGS;
- He favored higher density development to be grouped around a community center

With regards to RHNA and its allocation throughout the City, he said that the lawsuit, Hacienda TOD process and recent Housing Element certification served to identify and rezone 70 acres for high density development. He agreed that this plan should not be RHNA driven but also noted that none of the high density zoning to date has occurred on the east side. He referred to Ms. Dennis' comments, which beg the question of whether the City is attempting to meet its low and very-low income housing needs with this plan. He encouraged everyone to focus on market rate and affordability in terms of workforce housing and what it means in Pleasanton, rather than any preconceived notions of the targeted demographic.

With regards to alternatives, he agreed that it is important to ensure that the City does not shortchange itself throughout the process. He therefore supported further analysis of Alternative 6 as a worst case scenario, noting that they would retain the ability to scale it back to an appropriate fit for the community.

Councilmember Brown agreed that development should bear the cost of infrastructure. She acknowledged that the extension of El Charro Road is a part of the City's circulation plan but said she was put off by estimates that it would run $70-90 million just to access El Charro and then an additional amount to go under or over the railroad tracks.

Mr. Dolan clarified that the overall infrastructure cost is estimated at $60 million, which includes El Charro, the under crossing and the extension.

Councilmember Brown said that was more acceptable but even assuming 1,200 housing units, the project would run an incredible $50,000 per unit. She said she conducted significant research on development relative to the Urban Growth Boundary, both with the General Plan and Measure FF. She read from the General Plan where it speaks to exemptions for land and gravel in east Pleasanton, but noted that this is only for non-urban development.

Mr. Dolan stressed that staff is not advocating for any one particular methodology but clarified that a more careful read of that language provides for two programs. One discusses the circumstances under which urban services can be extended beyond the boundary and the other discusses under what circumstances the Council may move the boundary and that is where it references major versus minor.

Councilmember Brown asked if staff feels 100 acres is a minor change.

Mr. Dolan said it is a decision for the Council, not staff.

Councilmember Brown respectfully disagreed and said when she voted for Measure FF in 1996, she did understand it to mean the boundary could be moved to encompass either Cope Lake or the land below.

She responded to the remaining questions posed by staff as follows:

- She would prefer the OSC to remain at its current location. She also worried about the expense of relocating PGS and suggested there might be some creative mitigation efforts to improve the surrounding area. She also suggested they look at creative circulation adjustments, perhaps with access to PGS off of Busch or Boulder;
- A public school site, which she envisioned being land gifted for use as both a park and school, should be included;
- She supported curvilinear street design;

- The next two RHNA cycle requirements should be dispersed throughout the City in a balanced way;
- She would like, as is consistent with past practice, to see density greater at the center and feathered out to the edges of the plan area;

She said she found 6 to be too many alternatives, especially accounting for all the variables. She said she preferred the unit and density mixture in Alternative 1 but said she could also consider Alternative 4, which also has a 1:1 ratio of single to multi-family units. She said would like any alternative that moves forward to give greater consideration to the Urban Growth Boundary, locate the school site on the west side and minimize the total number of units while still respecting balance throughout the city.

Councilmember Narum responded to the questions posed by staff as follows:

- She agreed with fellow Council regarding the cost of infrastructure and support for the extension of El Charro Road, without phasing;
- She supported consideration of development beyond the Urban Growth Boundary but felt any decision on the need for a vote of the public to be premature;
- Having gone full circle on the matter, she was inclined to leave the OSC at its current location with some aesthetic enhancements. Relocation of PGS warranted more discussion;
- A school site, preferably west of El Charro and in conjunction with a public park, should be included;
- Busch Road and Boulder Street should connect through to El Charro;
- RHNA accommodations should be dispersed throughout the city, with no more than 50% of the City's total inventory located on the east side;
- Curvilinear streets sound nice but any decision is likely premature;
- Single versus multi-family unit mixture should not exceed 50% on the multi-family side;
- Lacking a central point, development should be evenly dispersed throughout the plan area;

With regards to density, she noted the 300 unit development at the corner of Bernal and Stanley which, while not specifically in the EPSP area, does have an impact. She said she would eliminate Alternatives 2 and 3 and, while certainly not advocating for it, Alternative 6 should be included as a project alternative to balance the "no project" alternative. She referred to several emails received that day that proposed the plan area accommodate 30% of upcoming RHNA allocations, with 60% single-family/40% multi-family ratio and a total of 1,500 units and said she would like to see this evaluated further.

Mayor Thorne responded to the questions posed by staff as follows:

- He agreed with fellow Council regarding the cost of infrastructure and support for the extension of El Charro Road, without phasing;
- He agreed that any decision regarding the Urban Growth Boundary would be premature at this time and stressed that he had no intentions of ignoring the provisions of Measure FF;
- He also agreed that the OSC would be cost prohibitive to move but did feel it required certain mitigations to remain in a residential location;
- A public school site must be considered, though he expressed concern about the district's ability to finance it;
- He supported the extension of Busch Road and Boulder Street as well as any circulation efforts that alleviate the traffic generated by new development on this side of town;
- He agreed that the plan area should not be overburdened with the majority of RHNA accommodation. He asked staff to divide the community into four quadrants, assess the existing balance and future opportunities throughout town;
- It is too early to comment on curvilinear street design;
- Single and multi-family units should be evenly mixed;
- Density should be feathered outward

With regards to alternatives, he questioned the viability of 1 and 2 in terms of supporting infrastructure. He felt 4, 5 and 6 were perhaps the most viable, with 6 being included as a worst case scenario for the

environmental analysis. He said he is sick and tired of RHNA and, while not sure he would be able to affect any change, reported that he was just appointed to the Executive Board of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). He encouraged every member of the public to ask candidates where they stand on RHNA before electing them to office where they continue to be ineffective.