

## Recommended Revisions

Recommended revisions to the following are below: 1) Draft Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch; 2) Draft Final Environmental Impact Report for the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch project; and 3) Draft Rezoning/Prezoning map for the Staples Ranch project. Text changes are in red.

### I. Draft Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch

1. Add a new paragraph at the end of the 2007 El Charro Road Cooperation and Cost-Sharing Agreements section on page 10.

#### Proposed Paragraph

The Specific Plan Amendment and any other land use entitlements within the Plan Area shall remain subject to all applicable requirements and provisions of the Cooperation Agreement, including but not limited to the requirement that all such entitlements be made subject to the conditions of approval specified in Section 10 ("Required Conditions of Approval") of the Cooperation Agreement. Pursuant to Section 18.1 of the Cooperation Agreement, in the event of any conflict between any provision of the Cooperation Agreement and the Specific Plan Amendment or any such entitlement, the provisions of the Cooperation Agreement shall govern and control.

*{This modification was recommended by Vulcan Materials.}*

2. Add a note to Figure III-3 on page 22.

#### Proposed Note

The landscape buffer area on the Continuing Care Community site may be used as a construction route until all phases of construction on the site are complete, if approved by the City Council.

*{This modification was recommended by Continuing Life Communities.}*

3. Modify draft design standard 2.2.1. on page 24.

#### Existing Language

Limit vehicular access to the site to Auto Mall Place, with no vehicular access to and from El Charro Road, except for emergency vehicles as described in 2.2.2 below. In the future, if El Charro Road east of the site becomes a public road, then regular vehicular access to and from El Charro Road may be considered.

#### Proposed Modification

2.2.1 Limit vehicular access to the site to Auto Mall Place, with no vehicular access to and from El Charro Road, except for emergency vehicles as described in 2.2.2 below. Subject to review and approval by the parties to the Cooperation Agreement pursuant to Sections 3.3 and 7.5 of the Cooperation Agreement, upon completion of an effective final design for the intersection between Vulcan Materials' private El Charro Road and the public El Charro Road (former Hanson haul road), ~~In the future, if El Charro Road east of the site becomes a public road,~~ then regular vehicular access to and from El Charro Road may be considered. The provisions of this 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 shall be imposed as conditions of approval upon the PUD and all other land use entitlements for the site.

*{This modification was recommended by Vulcan Materials.}*

4. Modify draft design standard 2.2.2. on page 24.

#### Existing Language

2.2.2 Provide a second, gated, emergency vehicle access to El Charro Road, following review and approval from Vulcan Materials, if El Charro Road remains a private road south of the Auto Mall Place intersection. The EVA should be designed so that it can potentially function as a secondary vehicular entry to the site when El Charro Road south of the intersection is improved and accepted as a public street.

#### Proposed Modification

2.2.2 Provide a single ~~second, gated,~~ emergency vehicle access to El Charro Road, conditioned upon ~~following~~ review and approval and a written license agreement from Vulcan Materials pursuant to Section 7.4 of the Cooperation Agreement. ~~if El Charro Road remains a private road south of the Auto Mall Place intersection.~~ The Sufficient private right of way within the site adjacent to the EVA shall be reserved ~~should be designed~~ so that it can potentially function as a secondary vehicular entry to the site, subject to the requirements of 2.2.1 above. ~~when El Charro Road south of the intersection is improved and accepted as a public street.~~ In any event, the site shall be designed to provide adequate access and circulation without any such secondary vehicular entry.

*{This modification was recommended by Vulcan Materials.}*

5. Modify draft design standard 2.2.5. on page 25.

Existing Language

2.2.5 Provide pedestrian connection points, to the extent feasible, to trails and pathways within the adjacent Community Park.

Proposed Modification

2.2.5 Provide pedestrian and bicycle connection points, to the extent feasible, to trails and pathways within the adjacent Community Park.

*{This modification was recommended by the Planning Commission.}*

6. Modify draft policy PU.9 on page 55.

Existing Language

PU.9: Work with the City of Livermore/ASCPA to ensure that flood protection facilities planned for the El Charro Specific Plan are in place, and that FEMA flood maps are modified to remove Staples Ranch from the 100 year flood zone, prior to occupancy of Staples Ranch development.

Proposed Modification

PU.9: Work with the City of Livermore/ASCPA ACSPA to ensure that flood protection facilities planned for the El Charro Specific Plan are in place, and that FEMA flood maps are modified to remove Staples Ranch from the 100 year flood zone, prior to occupancy of the Staples Ranch development.

*{This change is recommended by staff, for clarification only.}*

7. Modify the first paragraph on page 59.

Existing Language

As specified in the September 2007 Pre-Development and Cooperation Agreement between Vulcan Materials, Livermore, Pleasanton, Alameda County, and the ACSPA, improvements to El Charro Road, if not already completed by the City of Livermore for the El Charro Specific Plan development, would also need to be constructed by the ASCPA (under the Development Agreement with the City of Pleasanton) as part of any first phase of Staples Ranch development. Similarly, as permitted under the September 2007 Cost-Sharing Agreement between Livermore, Pleasanton, and the ACSPA, the Livermore flood control improvements planned for the El Charro Specific Plan, if not already completed by the City of Livermore, would also need to be constructed by the ASCPA as part of any first phase of Staples Ranch development.

Proposed Modification

As specified in required by and subject to the September 2007 Pre-Development and Cooperation Agreement between Vulcan Materials, Livermore, Pleasanton, Alameda County, and the ACSPA, if the improvements to El Charro Road, if are not already completed by the City of Livermore for the El Charro Specific Plan development, Pleasanton would also need to cause them to be constructed by the ASCPA ACSPA (under the Development Agreement with the City of Pleasanton) as part of any first phase of Staples Ranch development. Similarly, as permitted required under the September 2007 Cost-Sharing Agreement between Livermore, Pleasanton, and the ACSPA, if the Livermore flood control improvements planned for the El Charro Specific Plan, if are not already completed by the City of Livermore, Pleasanton would also need to cause them to be constructed by the ASCPA ACSPA as part of any first phase of Staples Ranch development. Any such roadway and flood control improvements shall be constructed so as to comply with all applicable provisions of the Cooperation Agreement, including but not limited to Section 3.2 thereof.

*{This modification was recommended by Vulcan Materials.}*

## II. Draft Final Environmental Impact Report for the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch Project

1. Retain the second paragraph of mitigation measure VQ-3.1 on page 4-8.

### Retain the Following Paragraph

Energy efficient lamp technologies shall be incorporated wherever possible. Mercury vapor shall be avoided. Incandescent lights shall be avoided unless they are integrated with a control mechanism that limits their operation time. The use of such lighting shall help minimize impacts on reduced visibility of the night sky.

*{Staff recommends that this paragraph be retained. Mercury vapor is considered to be one of the least energy efficient lighting sources.}*

2. Add the following paragraph on Page 4-8 after “3.3 Biological Resources”.

A new paragraph is added after the first paragraph on page 3.3.-17:

Although the loss of the San Joaquin spearscale population is a less than significant impact (and therefore no mitigation measures are required under CEQA), there are opportunities, both on site and off site, to improve this population. For example, prior to grading on the Staples Ranch property, the ACSPA will purchase credits from the Springtown Natural Community Preserve in Livermore, or purchase land at another appropriate mitigation area in Alameda County, for an equivalent acreage of spearscale habitat to the area currently occupied by spearscale on the Staples Ranch property. These off site commitments will be embodied in the development agreement between the applicant and the City. In addition, topsoil from any areas of Staples Ranch that are documented to contain populations of Spearscale can be separately stockpiled during grading operations, and then incorporated into appropriate areas within the Open Space Area of the Staples Ranch Community Park, if so desired by the City Council. Any on site proposal would be subject to the review and approval of the City Council as part of the PUD project review process for the Community Park.

*{Staff recommends this paragraph be added. On February 3 environmental groups expressed concern about San Joaquin spearscale. The applicant is willing to provide more San Joaquin spearscale either on or off site.}*

3. Remove mitigation measure PH-1.1 (concerning growth management) and revise text.

A. Page 4-11, immediately before section “3.9 Transportation”, revise to include the following text:

### **3.8 Population, Employment, and Housing**

Page 3.8-7, PH-1, is revised as follows:

PH-1. The proposed project would increase population and employment in the Project Area and the overall projected growth would be consistent with growth forecasts for the City; The City’s Growth Management Program Ordinance allows the City Council to vary the number of annual building permits, consistent with the General Plan, however, In that the timing of the development of the senior continuing care community ~~would have the potential to result in an exceedance of the annual limit for residential uses under the City’s Growth Management Ordinance.~~ will be guided by a Development Agreement, the Growth Management Ordinance will not be applicable. The City Council will consider the project and Development Agreement in light of how many units it believes are appropriate for construction in a given year. (PS) (NI)

Page 3.8-8, the third paragraph under “Housing”, is revised as follows: ~~However,~~ ~~t~~The City also has a Growth Management Ordinance that is intended to limit residential growth so that residential development remains within the housing cap. As part of the Growth Management Program Ordinance, residential development from the year 2005 through buildout is generally limited to 350 housing units per year but City Council may vary that number depending on the type of project. The senior continuing care community could have up to 800 units which would exceed the annual limit if the project were developed within a single year. However, since the timing of this project’s development will be guided by a Development Agreement that the City Council will consider, the Growth Management Program Ordinance will not control. In this regard, ~~the project could be considered to result in substantial the Growth Management Ordinance. However, Continuing Life Communities (CLC) has indicated that it plans to develop the senior continuing care community in phases. Since final phasing plans for this project have not been developed, the project would have the potential to exceed the City’s annual limit of 350 units.~~

*{Staff and the Planning Commission recommend that this mitigation measure be removed and that the timing of construction be required to be consistent with the Development Agreement for the project.}*

Page 3.8-11, text after Table 3.8-6 about PH-1.1, is deleted as follows:  
~~Mitigation Measure. If the City Council determines that the senior continuing care community is a residential project, the following mitigation measure would reduce the proposed project's potential to exceed the City's annual growth limits, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. (LTS)~~

~~PH 1.1 Phase construction of residential units at the senior continuing care community based on the City's Growth Management Ordinance. Construction of residential units, as determined by the City Council, shall be phased such that construction of residential units would not exceed the City's limits for residential development, as described in the City's Growth Management Ordinance and General Plan.~~

*{Staff and Planning Commission suggest that this text be deleted as timing of the construction of the project will be as set forth in Development Agreement.}*

B. Page 4-3, after the first paragraph, revise to include the following text:

Page S-44 regarding Mitigation Measure PH-1 is revised in accordance with revisions described later in this section for pages 3.8-7, 3.8-8, and 3.8-11.

*{Staff and the Planning Commission recommend that this mitigation measure be removed.}*

4. Revise Table 3.9-6 for clarification.

Page 4-12, before the first paragraph, revise to include the following text:

Page 3.9-17, Table 3.9-6, is revised as follows:

...Isabel Avenue extension (4 6 lanes) from Airway Boulevard to Portola Avenue...

Notes:...

...2. The Portola Avenue overcrossing (over 1-580) is not listed in the table, but is assumed in the existing + approved traffic model.

*{Staff recommends that the text be changed for clarification only. The existing plus approved traffic model assumed a 4 lane Isabel Avenue extension from Airway Boulevard to Portola Avenue.}*

5. Remove mitigation measure TR-10C (regarding the Dublin Boulevard/Dougherty Road intersection) and revise text.

Page 4-13, after the sixth paragraph, revise to include the following text:

Page 4-29, Mitigation Measure TR-10C is deleted, since the City of Dublin considers the improvement at the Dublin Boulevard/Dougherty Road intersection infeasible (see City of Dublin comment letter, comment 8-24, on page 3-61 of the Draft Final Environmental Impact Report). This impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Page 4-3, after the fourth paragraph, revise to include the following text:

Pages S-59 and S-60 regarding Mitigation Measure TR-10C is revised in accordance with revisions described later in this section for page 4-29.

*{Staff recommends that this mitigation measure be removed. The City of Dublin has confirmed that intersection improvements are infeasible at the Dublin Boulevard/Dougherty Road intersection. The draft Statement of Overriding Considerations addresses this intersection.}*

6. Edit the sixth paragraph of page 4-13 for clarification.

Page 4-13, sixth paragraph, revise as follows:

Page 4-28, Mitigation Measure TR-7C is deleted, since improvements at this intersection (El Charro Road at Stoneridge Drive) are already addressed by the Pre-Development and Cooperation Agreement. ~~Mitigation Measures TR-8C through TR-11C are renumbered to reflect the deletion of Mitigation Measure TR-7C.~~

*{Staff recommends the changes for clarification only. Several proposed mitigation measures refer to Mitigation Measure TR-11C, and renumbering the measures, although doable, may be confusing to future readers of the Final Environmental Impact Report.}*

### **III. Draft Rezoning/Prezoning Map for Staples Ranch**

The Draft rezoning/prezoning map for Staples Ranch was reviewed by the Planning Commission and recommended for adoption by the City Council. Since the meeting, staff has re-reviewed the map and believes that a small change should be made on the senior continuing care site. On the map reviewed by the Planning Commission a narrow strip of land (north east of the proposed health center) was proposed to be pre-zoned PUD-C. Staff recommends that this be changed to PUD-HDR/C, consistent with the proposed zoning of the other proposed "villa" units on the site. The map before the Council for review has been revised to reflect staff's recommendation.