

MINUTES  
OF THE  
CITY COUNCIL  
GENERAL PLAN WORKSHOP

May 23, 2006

**1. Call to Order:**

The workshop was called to order by Mayor Jennifer Hosterman at 6:30 p.m.

Those in attendance were as follows: City Councilmembers Steve Brozosky, Cindy McGovern, Matt Sullivan, Jerry Thorne and Mayor Hosterman. Staff members present were: Nelson Fialho, City Manager; Michael Roush, City Attorney; Jerry Iserson, Director of Planning and Community Services; Janice Stern, Principal Planner; David P. Culver, Finance Director; Susan Rossi, Assistant Finance Director; Julie Farnsworth, Director of Library Services; Jim Wolfe, Director of Parks and Community Services, Rob Wilson, Director of Public Works; Jacqui Diaz, Assistant to the City Manager; Pamela Ott, Director of Economic Development, Lorie Tinow, Director of Administrative Services; Steve Cusenza, Utility Manager.

**2. Economic and Fiscal Element of the General Plan:**

Review and provide comments on a Draft Economic and Fiscal Element of the General Plan. (SR 06:127)

Jerry Iserson presented opening comments indicating other Commissions have reviewed these elements of the General Plan and their comments are included in the staff report.

Janice Stern presented the staff report.

Steve Brozosky indicated he was happy with Policy 2, which attracts businesses that are a good fit with the resident/worker populations. He felt it was good to add more jobs so that residents don't have to commute out of the city. He referred to Program 4.4, regarding recruitment of local residents, and believed that was covered by the TriValleyJobs.com website and felt the Program wording should be "maintain" not to "establish". Program 13.9 is a new program requiring fiscal analysis for large housing and mixed-use projects. He believed there should be some kind of threshold that defines large housing.

Ms. Stern said there deliberately was no definition in order to maintain some flexibility.

Mr. Brozosky asked how expensive it was to prepare a report like this?

Ms. Stern said there was a model, which developers could follow and it would cost about \$10,000.

Mr. Brozosky then referred to Program 14.4, which is to fund the normal employer rate established by the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) and transfer any excess to a reserve to be used in the future. He asked if there could be a cap on this and if the fund reached 20% for the normal obligation anything over that could be applied to capital improvement projects. He did not like to have that money just sitting there.

Mr. Fialho said staff had applied that principle to the golf course reserve. Staff tried to advance at least four years of debt service. He said it was possible to use that model and have no more than four years of normal PERS costs.

Mr. Brozosky supported a plan like that.

Mr. Fialho indicated that when this policy is ready for implementation, the specifics would be presented to Council for approval and Council could set up thresholds at that time, as was done with the golf course, rather than specifying it in the General Plan.

Mr. Brozosky pointed out that the General Plan specifies that the funds cannot be used for anything except the reserve, so he wanted something that allowed for an alternative.

Mr. Fialho believed the last clause "except as otherwise determined by the City Council" gives Council the opportunity to address that in the future.

Mr. Brozosky asked if there should be a policy regarding funding the retiree medical cost liabilities?

Mr. Fialho said fundamentally that makes sense, but there are accounting standards that override whatever may be in the General Plan.

Ms. Rossi said there are existing General Plan policies that require the city to fund accrued expenses. That standard is probably higher than the accounting standards. The policy is for the city to fund liabilities as they come along and she thought that is the highest standard possible and is in the General Plan. It would apply to the retirees' medical costs.

Cindy McGovern wanted to make certain the Strategic Plan is in conformance with the General Plan. She referred to Policy 4, regarding promoting tourism, culture and recreational activities, and felt the programs under that policy did not actually address tourism and recreational activities, but rather referred only to attracting businesses. She felt there should be a program added under Policy 4 that actually dealt with tourism. She suggested working with the Convention and Visitors Bureau, the Pleasanton Downtown Association, Livermore Winegrowers Association, etc. to help support and cultivate tourism.

Mayor Hosterman felt that was a good point.

Ms. McGovern then referred to Goal 3 on page 15, where the words "and to develop additional revenue generating public facilities" were removed. She asked if staff did not believe it was important for public facilities to generate funding?

Ms. Stern felt the infrastructure and public facilities were necessary for business and the community rather than as revenue generating entities. However, if Council wants the wording reinserted, it could be done.

Ms. McGovern believed that since this was a fiscal policy, it would be wise to have the facilities generate income to help maintain them in the future.

Mr. Sullivan asked for an example. Did she mean charging for use of buildings or facilities like the sports parks?

Ms. Stern replied that would be cost recovery, which is a little different than revenue generating.

Mr. Fialho felt the problem with the Goal was that it was not correctly worded. The important point is cost recovery. That is the issue that Pleasanton is behind on. Many communities have gone to a cost recovery model where the full costs of providing a service are identified for a facility and then they set the recovery threshold. It could be 100% or 50% of the cost recovery.

Ms. McGovern then referred to page 16, Program 8.2, which says "continue to investigate new revenue sources," but it doesn't talk about implementing new resources. She asked for additional wording such as continue to investigate potential new revenue sources and somehow talk about how to generate revenue from those sources. She also had questions about Program 13.2 and 13.3 about the word "prohibit". She was opposed to using long-term debt for current operations.

Mr. Fialho agreed the practice should be discouraged, but felt if the word "prohibit" is used it limits staff's ability to have short-term borrowing between internal reserves. From time to time that is necessary to advance a capital project or Council priority.

Ms. McGovern referred to Program 13.8 and the preparation of periodic financial reports on funds received and expended. She did not understand why the program only talked about revenue received.

Mr. Fialho said the program could be changed to say "prepare periodic financial reports of actual revenue and expenditures for review by the City Council." That is currently done through the comprehensive annual financial report.

Ms. McGovern had the same comments as Mr. Brozosky regarding a definition for large housing in Program 13.9 and the necessary fiscal report. She understood and agreed with the need for flexibility as mentioned by staff. Regarding Program 14.4, she wondered if that could be an endowment account where the interest could be used for something else.

Ms. Rossi indicated it was a decision of Council whether to credit interest to the account or not. There are pros and cons for both sides. This is a general fund contribution, so the interest could flow to the general fund. There are no exterior regulations that require the city to credit the interest to that fund.

Mr. Fialho pointed out that 9.5% of payroll for miscellaneous employees and 16% for public safety employees is set aside for the reserve.

Ms. Rossi cautioned against setting a dollar or time limit on the fund because it follows economic cycles. A cycle could be ten years.

Ms. McGovern understood that but was uncomfortable having that much money tied up. She wanted to use the interest for other public needs.

Mr. Fialho commented that when the policy is implemented, the particulars would be identified and brought to Council for review in the future.

Ms. McGovern's final question was regarding Policy 18.5 and periodic revenue audits. She asked if there were periodic expenditure audits to make certain they were within budgets?

Ms. Rossi said everything is audited. Weekly expenditures are reviewed by several people with regard to conformance to budget or a more efficient way of doing things. There are also monthly and quarterly reports comparing expense to budget and reports are presented to Council. There is also a mid-year and mid-term report.

Ms. McGovern thought only certain departments were audited every year.

Mr. Fialho replied that every department is audited every year. The auditors validate the Finance Department's year-end reports to the Council. The outside auditors determine if there were any discrepancies.

Jerry Thorne said over the years, people tend to pick up on certain words or terms they want to apply to everything. A few years ago, it seemed people used paradigm for everything. He felt the current popular word was "sustainability." That has a specific definition, but it has been applied in the General Plan to sustainable solutions, sustainable cities, sustainable finances, etc. He wanted to be careful about using that word because over time it could lose its emphasis. On page 16, Strategies, he wanted to include elected officials in the outreach process to bring businesses to the city. He felt there should be a statement somewhere in the Policies that supported BART to Livermore.

Mr. Fialho believed Mr. Thorne was referring to the Strategic Plan, which was included as background material for the Fiscal Element. He explained that there is another opportunity to discuss it at a future session.

Mr. Thorne referred to page XI-9 and indicated he was glad to see a link between labor costs and revenues. On Page XI-14, he wanted to see a program to benchmark the city's fee structure and have some kind of matrix showing a comparison of Pleasanton to surrounding cities to make certain the city is competitive.

Mr. Fialho clarified the request as an opportunity to benchmark existing fees so they do not create a disadvantage for businesses while maintaining the city's revenue stream. Staff will incorporate that somehow.

Mr. Thorne felt staff was doing a good job with financial controls. Most cities are dealing with deficits and Pleasanton actually has surpluses. In order to stay that way, staff must look forward and continue to improve its current processes. He had various questions on how and when staff reviews expenses. He suggested various matrixes to reflect fiscal situations. For example, there is a matrix on occupancy (number of square feet per occupant of a building). There could be comparisons of that and benchmarking to make sure the buildings are occupied effectively and efficiently. There could also be benchmarks for utility costs, labor costs vs. percent of revenue. The city could track revenue per employee. Even though the city doesn't make products or make a profit, he would like to see a matrix that tells how effective the headcount is. He reiterated the staff was doing a great job, but he felt he would get more information from these kinds of matrixes than from detailed budgets and expense reports. He wanted the matrixes to include triggers for action points. For instance, if the budget was out of line for two months or quarters, then some kind of defined review would occur to see if a new direction needed to be taken. He felt that too often once a budget is approved, there is not

enough comparison of expenditures versus target and not enough review of revenue versus targets.

Mr. Fialho believed Mr. Thorne was using many terms from the private sector. He noted staff has tried to identify the cost to provide a service, which is reflected in the budget. There is a short-term and long-term financial plan and he felt staff has done a good job with the short-term. There will be presentations on the long-term strategies that will focus on ten-year revenues and expenditures. The suggested matrixes can show relationships for planning.

Matt Sullivan indicated he was encouraged by the concept of sustainability in the economic and fiscal elements and the General Plan overall. He agreed with Mr. Thorne that sometimes that phrase is overused, but in this case it is right on target. It is referring city finances and ways for the city to meet current needs as well as the needs of future generations. There is reference to balanced budgets, but that happens once and in this case sustainable city finances is about balanced budgets over the long term, especially in light of build out. He thanked staff and the Economic Vitality Committee for all their work on this element and he supported it in general. There are many strategies and tactics for fiscal viability. He wanted to know how to maintain that and felt there should be a strategic plan for the fiscal element. He liked the idea of a model for the General Plan build out land use. He asked what other strategies are there for looking at long term trends, forecasts or reviewing things going on in the state or country that could affect Pleasanton from a fiscal standpoint.

Mr. Fialho stated that staff has done five-year plans and acknowledged that as the city approached build out it needed to have more long term planning. Now that the new Finance Director has come on board, that kind of long-term analysis will be done and a report presented to Council for input. Part of that process may require policy direction from Council. For instance, to pursue more retail expansion if there is a need to increase sales tax revenues; or to focus on residential or commercial development to create a sustainable fiscal environment. What Council appears to be looking for will be coming forward as a separate item.

Mr. Sullivan acknowledged that but indicated a desire to have some kind of policy statement reflecting that. Under Goal 1, he wanted the environment included in the list of sustainable connections. He supported the Strategic Plan and looked forward to a session where he could present some comments.

Mayor Hosterman also thanked staff and the Economic Vitality Committee for their work on these elements. Back in the early nineties, the community focus was on concerns about developing too quickly, too many houses and the direction of the city. At that time, this Element served the city very well and it has come a long way. She was pleased with the new language and changes included in the Element. With a few more changes, the Element will serve the city well to build out. She thanked staff for the hard work and for listening to the Council and all the Commissions in updating this very important Element.

Ms. McGovern also thanked the Economic Vitality Committee and all the other Commissions for looking at this.

Mr. Fialho clarified that these documents will come back to Council as a final document called a Draft General Plan to be reviewed, discussed and debated for final approval some time late this year.

### **3. Public Facilities and Community Programs Element of the General Plan:**

Review and provide comments on a Draft Public Facilities Element of the General Plan.  
(SR 06:147)

Janice Stern presented the staff report.

Mayor Hosterman indicated the issue of water was extremely important to her. She noted 62% of the city's water came from the snow pack and to date there is no plan to protect the property across the Sierra to protect the water supply. She wanted to include a Water Element in the General Plan. The State of California will soon mandate a water element in all cities' general plans. She referred to a set of water principles that was recently passed by the Local Government Commission that deals with water availability and water quality. Every agency in California is being asked to ratify these principles. The State Water Control Board has already ratified these principles and has indicated the funding to agencies will be based on whether they had ratified the principles. She asked Council to keep an open mind regarding a water element. She noted the Local Government Commission was developing a template for water elements to make ratification of the same an easier process. Pleasanton is a water retailer and she felt it was even more imperative to consider the element.

Mr. Sullivan completely supported the idea. He felt water quality, supply, disposal, wastewater and storm water runoff were all one issue. There is an element for transportation, air quality, and soon for energy. He felt adequate supplies of clean water and dealing with storm water and disposal were some of the most critical infrastructure challenges for the city. As the State and the Valley continues to grow with more demands on those resources, it becomes more important to have good planning guidelines. He supported the Ahwanhee Water Principles mentioned by the Mayor, which are good management practices for water use and disposal. He presented comments on current policies: Under Policy 9, he wanted more language about water conservation strategies for the long term. For instance, work with Zone 7 to develop conservation plans and strategies for the long term. He further suggested reexamining the tiered rate structure for residential and commercial users to encourage conservation. He noted Pleasanton has a representative on the water retailers board to address water quality issues. He wanted that listed in the General Plan as something to continue to do. He suggested a policy to "encourage water retailers to continue to work with Zone 7 on water conservation and quality issues." Over the last few years, real progress has been made in working with Zone 7. On page VI-12, it indicates storm water runoff issues are to be covered under the conservation and open space element. If there were a Water Element, these issues would be taken care of. He felt all the water issues should be looked at from the same General Plan Element because they are all interrelated. He felt there should be some mention of the new Zone 7 Stream Management Master Plan. The city should review it and give input. There is also a newly commissioned study for improvement of stream flows to support steelhead habitats in Zone 7 streams. The city should also be involved in that. Those two issues should be part of the Water Element. He asked about the status of the construction and demolition ordinance as referred to on page VI-17.

Mr. Fialho indicated it is in draft form and was reviewed by the Planning Commission several years ago. It was not presented to Council due to some problems with the city's hauler. It will come to Council in the future.

Mr. Sullivan referred to page VI-45, Program 24.4, under the Wi-Fi policy, he felt it should "explore Wi-Fi opportunities" because he did not think a decision had been made to provide Wi-Fi downtown.

Mr. Fialho said technically that was true. There is an item coming before Council that relates specifically to the downtown in the next few months. Staff recommendation will be to do it. It is up to Council on whether it wants a bold statement regarding “providing” versus “exploring” in the General Plan. In order to maintain balance and allow flexibility, he suggested using the word “explore.”

Mr. Sullivan referred to the Human Services policies and asked for clarification that the Human Services Commission had reviewed them. He was assured by staff that had occurred. On pages VII-26 and 27, there is no discussion of any civic center master plan and he asked if that was intentional?

Mr. Fialho responded that is something staff is currently pursuing as a work item and his recommendation is not to include something so specific as a civic center master plan in the General Plan.

Mr. Thorne assumed that if there is a separate Water Element that it would be an accumulation of water issues from other Elements. If that is so, he did not object to a separate element. Regarding the Ahwanhee Water Principles, he preferred keeping an open mind and exercising caution. When a long list of things is adopted, they tend to be treated as rules rather than guidelines. He wanted to make certain there are appropriate aspects and impact analyses to make certain the money spent is in places to do the most good and not to get only a small amount of environmental control. He asked if the city depended completely on Zone 7 for the security of its water system?

Mr. Cusenza said no. Zone 7 is responsible for the source of supply facilities such as the aqueduct coming over the hill and the coordination with the State Department of Water Resources for that supply from the delta, the pumping facility that gets the water to the Valley, etc. The City of Pleasanton controls the security from the Zone 7 turnouts to the over 20,000 meters and the city wells. Each agency controls the security for its own facilities.

Mr. Thorne asked if there needed to be language in the Water Element that addressed the security of the water system?

Mr. Cusenza said there are many things already being done from an operational standpoint. Whether those things have to be stated in the General Plan is up to Council.

Mr. Fialho felt it would be best to consider what the appropriate options or language might be and bring that back to Council later.

Mr. Thorne referred to Goal 7, Program 12.2, page VI-37, and had the same comments about only buying recycled materials as he had on the water principles. He wanted to make certain the actions really made sense. The County has provided money to buy recycled materials, but some of those materials are more expensive and use more energy and cause more environmental impacts to manufacture than the original products. He felt the city should be careful and not just make a carte blanche statement that only recycled materials would be used. Also on Program 13.4 there is discussion about using incentives for using recycled materials and he was uncertain what kinds of incentives are meant. If it is in the General Plan, that should be defined.

Mr. Fialho acknowledged the problem with the statement is that it says “will provide” incentives. Perhaps promoting incentives allows flexibility so that in the future, as projects come forward, Council can give input without feeling its hands are tied.

Mayor Hosterman felt a positive incentive might be streamlining the permitting process.

Mr. Thorne then referred to the requirement for businesses and multi-family residences to participate in recycling programs. If the city requires participation, that implies some kind of enforcement and he asked how that would be done.

Ms. Stern said that refers to the fact that there is a requirement for trash container areas and those areas would then have to have recycling bins. One cannot force people to recycle, but there can be a requirement for the hardware to be available for recycling.

Mr. Thorne felt the city should be cautious about getting into regulations for the School District, such as minimum enrollments. He did not think that was Council’s responsibility. On another matter, he was uncertain about where a neighborhood park could be placed in the Happy Valley area.

Ms. McGovern said she had several comments. She started with the School District and indicated all the written material on the General Plan should be sent to the School Board for their review. They are the elected officials who make policy decisions for the District. She did not want to discuss anything regarding the District at this meeting. She agreed with Mr. Sullivan that there should be a review of the Zone 7 Stream Management Plan and inclusion in the General Plan somehow. Regarding wastewater and odor problems, she referred to maintaining the Odor Advisory Group and the hotline, setting an odor management goal or offsetting air emission quality standard, but was uncertain if those regulations should be set forth elsewhere or in the General Plan.

Ms. Stern indicated those concerns would be addressed in the Air Quality Element.

Ms. McGovern indicated she had attended DSRSD and Zone 7 meetings where water quality was discussed and she noted there was some concern about Zone 7 drilling additional wells and tapping the groundwater basin that could decrease water quality by overuse of the groundwater basin. She asked if there was something in the Water Element that referred to maintaining the groundwater basin at a certain level to maintain quality, taste and reduce the hardness of the water?

Mr. Cusenza indicated that was on page VI-12. There is reference to groundwater storage levels.

Mr. Fialho said a better place to look was page VI-35, Program 9.12, where it says, “Work with Zone 7 to implement water facility upgrades to improve water taste and to decrease water hardness.”

Ms. McGovern approved adding the new Program 9.14 and quoted the wording. She then referred to page VI-16 about solid waste and the fact that 20% of the solid waste originates outside the Pleasanton city limits. She asked if that affected the 50% waste diversion goals?

Mr. Fialho said no.

Ms. McGovern then referred to page VI-18 and the statement about the School District considering alternative uses for existing and proposed school sites. She hoped for some explanation about that from the School Board. On page VI-21, the acreage for the BMX park is off by one acre. On Page VI-23, if there is a park in Happy Valley, there is no mention of the Vineyard Avenue park and she felt that should be added to future community parks. When looking at the functions of the Alviso Adobe, she felt some of those were already known and should be included. Referring to page VI-26, third paragraph from the bottom, she believed the community garden at Val Vista had already been started and the verbiage of the paragraph should be changed. She then referred to page VI-33, Policy 2, Program 2.1, and suggested the wording should be changed from "including" a city hall fire station athletic facilities to "such as." She did not think it was determined to do all those things and there could be other things not listed. At the bottom of the page, there is reference to a "landmark civic center" and she requested clarification of the term.

Ms. Stern believed that meant something with architectural distinction.

Mr. Fialho indicated the key would be to provide some sort of gateway or architectural feature that is complimentary of the downtown.

Ms. McGovern then asked if the city was contemplating annexation of the chain of lakes property?

Mr. Fialho said yes.

Ms. McGovern mentioned page VI-37, Program 13.10, and asked if the Food Scrap Composting Program had been proven to be cost effective?

Mr. Fialho said there has not been an analysis of the two-year implementation program. Staff does know there is increased diversion from the landfill resulting from food scrap recycling. It is not what was initially envisioned, but is about 10-15% additional diversion.

Ms. McGovern wanted to know if these types of programs were cost effective. It is not that they are important, but perhaps there are other ways of doing them. She expressed her support of containers for recycling at downtown outdoor events and in city parks. She then referred to providing sufficient sites and improvements for a full range of library facilities and wanted to have new development to help cover the cost of library facilities. She supported adding the word "libraries" to Program 2.1, page VI-33.

Mr. Fialho quoted the section "developers should pay their fair share for the development and use of municipal facilities." He noted that AB1600 enables the city to identify the kinds of facilities needed long term and libraries fit into that.

Ms. McGovern then referred to page VI-43, Program 19.1, about increasing hours of operation for recreational facilities. This could affect the youth of the community and provide more positive things to do in the community. Kids could use these facilities even after curfew and she supported being able to offer more positive alternatives for the youth of the community. On Program 24.6, she supported providing Wi-Fi for the community. Then on page VI-46, Program 27.2, to encourage pedestrian and bike friendly development, she felt the city had missed the boat on bike friendly development. She asked if there was a way to go back to rectify parts of the community.

Mr. Fialho replied this was covered in the traffic circulation element and noted there is funding available regionally and locally to allow the city to phase those bike lanes into the circulation system over time. It is a matter of priority and funding through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Ms. McGovern indicated it is difficult when more than one topic is addressed in more than one Element. She felt it was hard for the community to follow. She suggested footnotes to indicated information available in other parts of the General Plan.

Steve Brozosky stated he did not agree with the definition of sustainability on page VI-1. It appears to say the city only uses things that are recyclable. That could be a good goal, but if everything is not recyclable, it could still be a sustainable city. He felt sustainability of the economics is just as important as the sustainability of the environment. The Elements should include economic considerations. On page VI-16, regarding the Pleasanton transfer station, he noted on the last General Plan that 8% of refuse was from outside the city and now it is at 20%. He asked if it was a goal to reduce that so the city is taking care of its own needs and not filling up resources from other locations?

Mr. Fialho explained the transfer station is not operating at near the capacity it is permitted. There is ample room to accommodate self-haul users from Pleasanton and Dublin. The formula for using landfill is not affected. He related how the diversion formula is calculated. He reiterated the transfer station is not near capacity and noted it is more convenient for many to use. He talked about the benefits in routing the traffic to the transfer station and possibly charging a gate fee. He noted El Charro has possibilities for that. He also explained that the city has the ability to deny any request to create the transfer station as a regional facility. The city allows only limited use by Dublin residents for recycling, not refuse.

Mr. Brozosky suggested raising the rates for non-Pleasanton residents. He noted that ten to fifteen tons of diverted material out of 720 tons was not enough. He felt there should be a goal to increase that amount. He felt if the Food Scrap Composting Program was not diverting enough material, it was not worth continuing the program. On page VI-17, regarding the Go Green Program and its adoption in thirteen states, he felt it should state in 2006 it was thirteen states and growing. He mentioned the Val Vista garden and continued on page 33 about Policy 2 that says developers should pay their fair share, it should say "developments" not "developers". Regarding Program 3.1, about required annexation, he felt some qualification should be added about only doing it when it makes financial sense to the city. Program 4.1 referred to the landmark civic center and he wanted it to say a civic center to provide "efficient" services to the residents. Program 4.2, top of page VI-34, talks about new facilities and mentions a 1,000-seat amphitheater on the Bernal property. Mr. Brozosky felt it should not have a specific number of seats since that decision has not been made. In Program 8.1, regarding sewage collection, fourth sentence, the "i.e." should be changed to "e.g." He then referred to Program 13.10 and indicated the Food Scrap Composting Program should be analyzed and continued to support where it makes sense. Another point he raised was to support local recycling facilities and not taking the material all over the state. He wanted a goal to use nearby facilities. He suggested developing a good program to facilitate collection and disposal of household hazardous waste like fluorescent light bulbs and batteries. He mentioned Program 13.14, regarding e-waste and said "electrical" should be changed to "electronic" waste. He noted most cities do not pay for disposal of e-waste, but use private services. He suggested a policy that continues to deal with e-waste but for the city to try to find outside sources or commercial ventures to take care of it.

Mayor Hosterman said that would be taken care of in the future, but for the present it made sense to have the existing language in the General Plan to support existing practices. All the things mentioned have ongoing changes and the city staff is always looking at new ways to provide the services.

Mr. Brozosky wanted to see something to encourage using the programs and to find outside funding sources as a goal. There are other places that encourage finding grants for facilities and he wanted a policy that did that here. He then referred to Program 16.3, regarding expansion of the Pleasanton Library, and felt if expansion is not feasible, then there should be language that addresses building another facility or other alternatives for expanding library service.

Mr. Fialho suggested rewording to say, “explore (rather than support) the expansion of the Pleasanton Library and associated site improvements to meet the community’s needs.”

Mr. Brozosky wanted to support it, but if it was not feasible to expand the library, he wanted to support what the next alternative would be.

Ms. Stern suggested, “Support the expansion of Pleasanton Library services and associated facility needs.”

Mr. Brozosky agreed with that wording. He then referred to Program 17.17, regarding using the Alameda County Fairgrounds for recreational and cultural activities. The wording is to “explore” using that, but he said it is being used today and felt the wording should be “continue to explore.” He questioned the need for Program 17.21, which specifically refers to a neighborhood park for the Happy Valley area. There are parks identified throughout the city and they are not all being developed yet. He did not know why the city would build a park here and not in the Vineyard Corridor or other areas of the city. That does not fit in with everything else the city is trying to do. He referred to Program 17.23, regarding trails and pedestrian walkways to connect parks, and suggested in addition it should list bicycle trails. On page VI-43, Program 18.2, he asked if there was a master plan for the Aquatic Center that already refers to creation of a toddler pool?

Mr. Fialho said there is no document that shows the expansion plan phased, but it has been discussed on several occasions and there is an assumption that another pool would be added. It could be a toddler pool or a lap pool.

Mr. Brozosky felt the program was to support the master plan but did not need to be specific. Program 24.3, page VI-45, talks about pedestrian signage for public facilities, i.e. restrooms, libraries, city hall, within the downtown, and he felt that was pretty specific for a General Plan and he wondered if it should be included.

Ms. Stern indicated that came from a discussion at the Planning Commission regarding the need for restrooms downtown and signage to find them. She believed that could be accomplished by putting it in the Downtown Specific Plan.

Mr. Brozosky felt providing wi-fi connection downtown would be accomplished before the General Plan is adopted. He asked if things that are accomplished are then removed from the General Plan or wording changed?

Mr. Fialho indicated the language would be modified to reflect the current reality.

Mr. Brozosky supported expanding the wi-fi to public areas throughout the city, such as parks. He cited Program 26.10 and indicated he did not know what it meant. Was it to expand diversity and to make certain a facility met the widest range of diversity?

Ms. Stern felt that might be a good wording.

Ms. McGovern felt it meant diverse needs of the community, not the diversity of a person.

Mr. Brozosky then commented on Program 28.4 and felt the word “sufficient” should be removed. He agreed the items regarding the School District should be reviewed by the School Board and further review of the land use should be done before the District develops demographics tables.

Ms. Stern indicated staff planned to give the School Board the preliminary preferred plan for review. She indicated the demographic projections are slightly different than what the city is doing. The School Board is looking at changes in generation rates of units when there are fewer units being built and there are replacements of families in older tracts. That is where the changes take place rather than in terms of where the homes are or how many.

Mr. Sullivan believed one of the action items from the joint meeting with the School Board was to do another demographic study based on the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Fialho said staff would provide the Preferred Land Use and the two alternatives and they would give input regarding their preference. The District would confirm the student generation based on the preferred alternative. Even though one may disagree with some conclusions of the demographer’s report, it provides good background information in terms of what is happening to the population.

Ms. McGovern felt that section should be a little more generic and should let the community know the School District does demographic statistics yearly and sets their priorities for schools based on those figures.

Mr. Brozosky felt the General Plan should reference the District study and not include it in the General Plan.

Mr. Fialho felt it depended on what Council felt the General Plan should be. For someone new to the community, it gave a snapshot of what is happening in the community from a demographic standpoint.

Mr. Brozosky pointed out the District updated the demographics more often than the city does its General Plan. That is why he did not want the document as part of the Plan.

Ms. McGovern felt when the city talks about smaller units, more condominiums or rental apartments, it definitely affects the demographer’s report.

Mr. Brozosky referred to discussion about adding a Water Element and believed the direction has been set for the General Plan and it has taken a long time to get to this point. He did not support changing the process or adding more review cycles that would increase the time to get the General Plan. He agreed and disagreed with various parts of the Ahwanhee

principles, but was uncertain how it would fit into the General Plan. There might be certain elements that could be incorporated, but he did not want to adopt the entire Ahwanhee principles.

Mr. Sullivan referred to the existing General Plan, which encouraged neighborhood schools. He supported keeping that language with some modification based on the final land use plan and the School District demographics.

Mr. Brozosky agreed. Neighborhood schools build neighborhoods. Although the city has no control of the schools, from a planning and traffic standpoint, it makes sense to have neighborhood schools.

Mr. Fialho referred to the water issue and cited Attachment 4. General Plans often have charts and graphs that analyze existing facilities and comparisons of standards. Staff has tried to identify existing facilities and match that with Pleasanton Unified School District's facilities to get an index per population. That is then matched with the national guideline for the only purpose of providing a benchmark. That is a launching point for further discussions and planning of future recreational facilities. It is a good source document.

There was consensus to keep the chart.

Ms. McGovern asked if there was information on how much open space and parks are provided per person by the city.

Ms. Stern indicated it is in this section and there is a standard provided on page VI-20-21.

Ms. McGovern believed the Planning Commission wanted the city to adopt its own standard and not just rely on the national standard.

Mr. Fialho agreed, but said that was not part of this discussion.

## 6. Meeting Open to the Public

Kevin Close, a Happy Valley resident, referred to Goal 10, Program 17.21, regarding a park in the Happy Valley area. He wanted the reference to be to a park in South Pleasanton and not the unincorporated area of Happy Valley. The EIR supporting the Happy Valley Specific Plan stated the large lots in the area should take care of the need for parks and any other needs would be served by the Bernal property community park. He wanted to avoid any piecemeal annexation by the City of Pleasanton, which may create an island and thereby force other annexations to the City.

Vanessa Kawaihau, a Happy Valley resident, referred to policy 3, the annexation into the City of Pleasanton, and felt it was a good thing when accessing city utilities. However, it does not cover properties already annexed to the city accessing its utilities. She stated the County is developing an onsite wastewater treatment policy, which includes all territories within Alameda County. That includes properties in Pleasanton, which have septic tanks and may need to access city utilities. She then talked about Policy 9.10 on page VI-35, which talked about evaluating water supplies as part of the growth management plan report, and noted that earlier this year Council decided there would no longer be growth management reports. She agreed with the school things and had mixed feelings about the Ahwanhee principles. She believed the

public golf course was not fully mitigated until the bypass road is built and the Alviso Adobe park is actually constructed or started. She agreed with Mr. Close regarding the Happy Valley Park. The Council had said it would not look at specific plan areas and Happy Valley is a Specific Plan. Council is changing that Specific Plan by putting an item in the General Plan that says there will be a park there. If it is to serve the people in Carriage Garden and Rose Pointe, then it should say South Pleasanton. If it is for future residents of Lund Ranch and the Spotorno property, then say that, but don't identify it as Happy Valley. She felt that would require annexation of 14-20 properties and/or to gain access over private roads so the Rose Pointe people can access it without going onto a major thoroughfare. As an historic park, she suggested adding the cemetery to the list as a "green cemetery". She noted another one in Mill Valley.

There were no further speakers.

#### 5. Next Steps and Matters Initiated by Council

Mr. Fialho indicated a draft form of this topic would be available by the end of the calendar year for review. Staff is still on schedule for an EIR for the spring of 2007. The Open Space Element will be reviewed tomorrow by the Planning Commission and will be presented to Council some time in late June. A specific date has not been set.

Mayor Hosterman asked that Council be open to the possibility of creating a Water Element. All of the language is already contained in the existing General Plan and it is a matter of naming another element, which she felt was important when talking about strategies watershed by watershed instead of city by city. She felt there was an opportunity to use a template, which would be offered, to cities. This is in anticipation of a mandated water element by the State of California in the future. She felt putting all the water issues under one category would make it easier to find and discuss in the future.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the language could be combined into one place and brought back at the end of the year without delaying the process?

Mr. Fialho said that was possible. Alternatively, the decision could be made later once Council has a better idea of what the total General Plan looks like.

Mayor Hosterman asked if staff needed to know at this meeting which scenario to use?

Mr. Fialho said either option is okay. He preferred to stay with the existing process and make a decision on the Water Element at the end of the process.

A special meeting was not called.

#### 6. Adjournment

There being no further discussion, the workshop was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Gonzales  
Deputy City Clerk