



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

City Council Chamber
200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566

APPROVED

Wednesday, May 14, 2008

*(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings
and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)*

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission meeting of May 14, 2008, was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chair Blank.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Planning and Community Development; Donna Decker, Principal Planner; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Steve Bocian, Assistant City Manager; Mike Tassano, Deputy Director of Public Works/Transportation; Robin Giffin, Associate Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary.

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Phil Blank, Kathy Narum, and Jennifer Pearce.

Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Anne Fox, Greg O'Connor, and Arne Olson.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 9, 2008

Commissioner Pearce noted a typographical error in the spelling of Commissioner O'Connor's name in the first sentence of the fifth full paragraph on page 13 and requested that the correction be made accordingly.

Commissioner Pearce requested that the second sentence of the fourth full paragraph on page 16 be modified to read as follows: "Commissioner Pearce commented that the new tank does not look like ~~not "farm-y"~~ *an old farm* but like a new farm.

Commissioner Pearce requested that the second sentence of the paragraph under Green Building Points on page 29 be modified to read as follows: “She inquired if the Commission would support *the discussion of* this amendment.”

Commissioner Pearce requested that the second to the last paragraph on page 32 be modified to read as follows: “Commissioner Pearce stated that she was disappointed that ~~all~~ *many of* the good courses were frontloaded and that there was one afternoon when *one of* the only ~~thing~~ *offerings* was a Mobile Tour, which was interesting but basically involved redevelopment ~~in~~ *or* the waterfront, *neither of* which is ~~not~~ applicable to ~~most~~ *many* cities.”

Chair Blank requested that the third sentence of the first full paragraph on page 16 be modified to read as follows: “He noted that he was ~~impressed~~ *surprised* by the mass of the water tank as well as its color.”

Chair Blank requested that the first sentence of the ninth paragraph on page 17 be modified to read as follows: “Commissioner Fox stated that if the Commission were considering this use permit without ~~no~~ *any* work having been done previously....”

b. April 23, 2008

Commissioner Pearce requested that the first sentence of the fourth full paragraph on page 16 be modified to read as follows: “Commissioner Pearce noted that she had recently attended a planning discussion panel of experts on *Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)* and Transit Adjacent Developments (TAD), and although....”

Commissioner Pearce requested that the second sentence of the fourth full paragraph on page 18 be modified to read as follows: “She noted that ~~she visualized this as~~ *this looked like* passive open space *on the plans* and inquired whether the applicant had envisioned a lawn.”

Commissioner Pearce requested that the first sentence of the last paragraph under Communications on page 27 be modified to read as follows: “Commissioner Pearce inquired ~~whether there had been any change with respect to the trees about the current work on the heritage tree and the status of the trees.~~”

Chair Blank requested that the second sentence of the second paragraph on page 6 be modified to read as follows: “He read *from another project* the *standard* condition: “The buildings covered by the approval....”

Chair Blank requested that the second sentence of the sixth paragraph on page 21 be modified to read as follows: “He noted that *this* was a market decision....”

.Chair Blank thanked staff for the sheet on the procedure to operate the video projector. He noted that the projector was not working during the City Council meeting and was not sure if this would be an issue at this time. He indicated that he was not certain if this matter should be considered under Matters Initiated by Commission Members.

Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the minutes of April 9, 2008 and April 23, 2008, as amended.

Commissioner Narum seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, and Pearce.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Fox, O'Connor, and Olson.

The minutes of April 9, 2008 and April 23, 2009 were approved as amended.

3. MEETING OPEN FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ANY ITEM WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA.

There were no speakers.

4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA

Ms. Decker advised that the note under Item 6.a. stating that the review of the Specific Plan amendment has been continued to the May 28, 2008 meeting. She noted that this date, as well as the dates on the schedule sheet for the Staples Ranch hearings, are incorrect and that to date, no certain dates have been set. She indicated that the Specific Plan amendment hearing will be re-noticed once a date has been scheduled.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no items for consideration.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch Project

Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for a Specific Plan amendment to the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan for the Staples Ranch project and review of the Specific Plan amendment to the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan (PSP-11).

Steve Bocian, Assistant City Manager, stated that two presentations would be made, one on the project itself which he would be presenting, and the other on the Draft EIR document which would be presented by Mr. Rodney Jeung, Project Director from PBS&J, the consulting firm that prepared the Draft EIR. He then introduced Ms. Natalie Irwin, PBS&J, Project Manager for the Draft EIR project; Mr. Stuart Cook, Assistant Director of the Alameda County Surplus Property Authority, who has been very involved in the project and will answer any questions about the

property; and Mr. Mike Tassano, City Deputy Director of Public Works Transportation, who will answer any questions related to traffic.

Mr. Bocian stated that the purpose of the meeting is to provide a forum to receive comments from the public and the Planning Commission regarding the completeness and adequacy of the Draft EIR. He noted that within the context of this process, the goal and interest is to take comments, analyze them, and respond to them in the Final EIR. He added that people who were unable to attend the meeting and have questions may submit their comments to staff through June 4, 2008.

Mr. Bocian stated that the Draft EIR references the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan which is being proposed to be amended as part of this project. He then displayed a PowerPoint presentation which highlighted the Specific Plan area, the undeveloped 124-acre Staples Ranch site that the Draft EIR is primarily concerned with, and the 169-acre project area which extends all the way to the Arroyo, to the other side of El Charro Road, and to I-580. He noted that the City is proposing to annex the entire project area, which is slightly larger than the project site. He next presented the surrounding land uses and provided information on some of the developments around the site, including the 250-acre El Charro Specific Plan project in Livermore, the 1.5 million acres of retail plan, the over 1,000-acre 3,100-residential unit Dublin Fallon Village project which includes 2.5 million acres of commercial uses, and the 1,700-acre 1,500-residential unit Dublin Ranch area. He pointed out that the Draft EIR frequently references the changing nature of the area and the fact that there has been development planned for the area for some time.

Mr. Bocian presented the site area, showing the land use plan in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that the City entered into with Alameda County Surplus Property Commission in 2006. He showed the current site plan and noted that the City Council approved the reconfiguration of the City park by Stoneridge Drive. He pointed out the locations of the proposed automall, the Continuing Life Communities assisted living facility, and the neighborhood park, indicating the access to and from the project sites and noting that Stoneridge Drive does not go through.

Mr. Bocian stated that the MOU requires that the proposed projects go through the normal development review process. He indicated that there will be public meetings on all the Planned Unit Development (PUD) projects and that the Final EIR will come back to the Commission for review and recommendation to the City Council.

He then turned over the floor to Mr. Brian Dolan, Director of Planning and Community Development, who will explain the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

Mr. Dolan stated that he was aware that the Commission has just gone through the EIR process with the Oak Grove process and noted that it would be useful to revisit the purpose of CEQA prior to the review of the Draft EIR for the Staples Ranch project. He indicated that CEQA basically has two primary purposes, the first of which is to provide a public disclosure document to give as much information as possible to the public as well as to the decision makers so they can understand the project as they consider all issues and make their decision. He then explained

the second purpose, which is to provide an evaluation of the environmental impacts and the ways in which those impacts might be reduced to less than significant levels through fairly defined methodology involving setting the thresholds of significance. He noted that sometimes those thresholds are suggested in the CEQA guidelines provided by the State, sometimes they evolve from acceptable practice throughout the State in various jurisdictions implementing CEQA, and sometimes they have a very local orientation through thresholds that have been adopted by the City in its General Plan or other regulatory documents.

Mr. Dolan continued that it is also important to understand the caveats and possible important exceptions to the two purposes, what CEQA is not. He stated that CEQA is not intended to make a recommendation on the project and should be an objective look on the impacts and suggested mitigations. He noted that theoretically, it should be just as useful, regardless of whether the ultimate decision is to support it or not. He added that the information should be factual, straightforward, and objective. Mr. Dolan stated that it is important to note that CEQA acknowledges that the documents are rarely perfect, particularly at the first draft, and that is the reason why the process includes a draft and a final document. He pointed out that sometimes, the final document is not perfect, but it nevertheless needs to be sent out with its imperfections, as long as the issues have been addressed as best as possible and there is enough information to make a good, solid decision.

Mr. Dolan further noted that there are some issues that do not rise to the level of significant environmental impact in CEQA, which should be addressed not necessarily through the CEQA process but through a process that operates outside of the CEQA document, such as the conditions of approval of the project.

Mr. Bocian then reiterated that the purpose of meeting is to receive comments regarding the Draft EIR and that there will be ample opportunity in the future to ask questions about the project itself.

Rod Jeung commended staff for the excellent and thorough staff report. He stated that his role is two-fold: first, to give a "Reader's Digest" version of the Draft EIR; and second, to listen and take down notes. He indicated that the Draft EIR is an information document to help the public and the Commission in its decision-making process. He noted that this is the draft stage of the process and that he would like to hear all the questions the Commission might have so he can prepare responses later on to ensure that the Commission is provided the basis to make an informed decision about the project.

With respect to the document, Mr. Jeung stated that the standard topics are covered and that what is important is to understand the existing baseline and then the overlay which shows how the project changes those existing conditions. He noted that those changes represent the impact, which is what is identified and presented in the Draft EIR for the benefit of the community. He indicated that CEQA acknowledges that there are going to be changes as a result of the project, but it wants the community to understand that some of those changes are substantive and may affect community values. He stated that the goal is to come up with mitigation measures and make recommendations that would take those impacts below the defined thresholds of significance.

Mr. Jeung stated that his presentation is intended to be a broad summary of all the various topics in the Draft EIR and to show how the environmental impacts are analyzed and classified, basically as “LTS” or Less-than-Significant, “PS” or Potentially Significant, and “SU” or Significant and Unavoidable. He noted that it is important to look at the “SU” column as these are situations in which the impacts cannot be pushed below the threshold.

Mr. Jeung noted three areas with significant impacts: (1) Aesthetics and Visual Quality, which addresses the change in the appearance and visual character of the site where current open space is converted to a mixture of urban uses; (2) Air quality, which considers the number of automobile trips associated with the project and results in emissions that contribute to air quality problems; and (3) Transportation, which consists of intersection impacts in other jurisdictions. He noted that the intersection impacts that may not be resolved occur outside the City of Pleasanton, at intersections in Dublin and Livermore. He noted that the solution proposed in the Draft EIR to address this specifically refers to an interagency cooperative agreement where Pleasanton can work with other cities and come up with an approach that would identify the cities’ fair share contribution to impacts in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Jeung then addressed other impacts that have some significance and how the mitigation measures proposed to address those impacts.

- Visual quality – lights and glare from the automall, the community park, and the senior care community center. The Draft EIR calls for very specific lighting plans that address, among other things, the hours of operation, the light intensity in terms of footcandles, and the height of light fixtures.
- Air quality – exposure of the senior care community center and residences along freeway to toxic air contaminants, which present issues with health risk. The mitigation calls for a health risk assessment for any residential development within 500 feet of the freeway. It acknowledges that the freeway may be widened.
- Biology – potential for special status species listed by State and Federal governments, such as the red-legged frog, the tiger salamander, and other species that have the potential to occur on site, particularly in the Arroyo Mocho. Mitigation measures are specifically identified to reduce the impacts on those species through fencing, monitoring during construction, training of construction workers, various environmental permits, and light restrictions to avoid disturbance to species in the Arroyo Mocho.
- Hazards – potential concerns for the project in terms of proximity to the Livermore Airport. The Draft EIR identified the different types of airport safety zones. In consultation with the Airport Land Use Commission, the site is not within the safety zones, and the residential project is consistent with criteria of those safety zones and is outside the areas of concern.

- Water Quality and Hydrology – concern for pollutants discharged to the Arroyo Mocho which affect the water quality and the aquatic resources inhabiting the Arroyo. Mitigation calls for specific water quality management plans.
- Flood and flood hazards – numerous regional discussion on how best to handle potential flood hazards. The Draft EIR identifies the creation of a storm water community services authority which would be responsible for a detention facility in the neighborhood park. The City of Livermore will construct flood improvements to solve the flood problems in the project site, and in the event that Livermore does not do this, the County will initiate those improvements.
- Noise – there is concern about noise at the senior continuing care community from aircraft and vehicular traffic on I-580. Even though the project calls for a 20-foot high berm and an eight-foot tall soundwall along I-580, there is a potential for noise impacts. Mitigation sets standards for reducing aircraft noise and calls for a detailed study at the time the project is ready to come forward to reduce potential freeway noise.

Mr. Jeung stated that part of CEQA’s role is to look for ways to minimize the potential impacts that have been identified for the project, and one of the ways to do this is to identify other alternatives that would accomplish some of the project objectives. He described each of the four alternatives identified for the project:

1. No Project Alternative – do nothing; the site would remain as is without constructing any of the proposed projects, which would not satisfy the project objective to develop the site with economically beneficial land uses. This alternative is present only to satisfy CEQA. It would not be relevant in the long-term because the site will eventually be developed.
2. Existing Specific Plan Alternative – the existing Specific Plan governs the land uses in this area is associated with a substantial amount of development. It would allow 30 acres of retail service commercial uses or 350,000 square feet of additional commercial floor space and 70 acres of service commercial and light industrial uses which, according to the City’s Floor Area Ratio, would be close to a million square feet.
3. Ice Center Alternative – a four-rink, 138,000-square-foot ice-skating facility that would accommodate 2,200 spectators is proposed within the 17-acre community park. With the exception of this change for the community park, all other project proposals would stay in place.
4. Open Space Alternative – passive recreational activities at the community park; no active recreation currently proposed for the community park would be built.

Mr. Jeung stated that CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified which would consider only the environmental and physical impacts and not include the fiscal, socio-economical, or other community needs. He noted that this would identify the alternative which would have the least effect in terms of changing the physical environmental. The environmentally superior alternative would be the open space alternative.

Mr. Jeung concluded his presentation by identifying the next steps in the process:

- Comments on the Draft EIR will be received up to June 4, 2008.
- Responses to comments received would be prepared which would clarify, elaborate, and provide explanations and the information base for the Commission and the Council to make an informed decision.
- A Mitigation Monitoring Program would be developed that would reflect all mitigation measures proposed to help reduce the impacts to Less Than Significant and spell out the specific details about when those measures are to be implemented, who would be responsible for the implementation, and if there would be monitoring associated with the Program.
- A Final EIR would be prepared and will come back to the Planning Commission for review.
- To the extent that any decision regarding the project is made, knowing that there are some significant unavoidable impacts, the City has to make a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which states that the project is still meritorious even with significant unavoidable impacts.
- After conscious deliberation, the Planning Commission can go ahead and recommend approval, denial, or modification of the proposed project.

Chair Blank inquired what the health assessment involved. Mr. Jeung replied that the health assessment would take a look at the potential exposure of residents and occupants of the senior care facility to cancer risks. He indicated that the incidences of cancer and its significance is generally ten in a million.

Chair Blank inquired if the assessment is restricted strictly to cancer risks. Mr. Jeung replied that it would take a look at other pollutants as well but that the primary indicator is cancer risk.

Chair Blank inquired if lead coming from aircraft from Livermore would be caught in the risk assessment. Mr. Jeung replied that the assessment would typically focus on traffic coming from I-580. He stated that one of the things they did in terms of trying to understand whether there might be a health risk associated with aircraft activity was consult with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), which indicated that there would be a potential health risk if aircraft flyover is within 600 feet above the development. He added that he also checked with the Livermore Municipal Airport and was told that their aircraft were about 1,800 feet above where residences would be located.

Chair Blank stated that he believed the Draft EIR reported the altitude to be 800 feet. Mr. Jeung indicated that he would look into that.

Chair Blank noted that the Draft EIR states that the development is not within the airport land use area but that it was his understanding that some parts of the project are in the airport influence area. Mr. Jeung confirmed Chair Blank's statement.

Ms. Giffin clarified that the Draft EIR states that the pollutant that the health assessment will be looking at with respect to the Senior Care Facility is just diesel particulate matter not other pollutants.

Chair Blank thanked staff and the consultant for their excellent presentations. He complimented the consultants for a great document and indicated his appreciation for the excellent visuals.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Ralph Kanz, Conservation Director of the Alameda Creek Alliance, expressed several concerns about the biological resources on the site and requested that they be properly and fully mitigated through the course of the project. He noted that the Draft EIR disregarded the steelhead trout, claiming that they have a low probability of occurring. He stated that there is potential for them to occur once a passage is provided for those fish, which may occur within two years and which will allow fish to come all the way up toward the Arroyo Mocho. He requested that the EIR address this issue.

Mr. Kanz then expressed concern that the San Joaquin spearscale was not addressed, noting that the Draft EIR stated that mitigation work done on the species by a previous project provides mitigation for this project as well. He indicated that he did not believe that was appropriate and that this project needs to mitigate for the loss of habitat for that plant rather than for the loss of the number of plants. He suggested that there be some off-site mitigation done for the loss of that habitat.

Mr. Kanz inquired if tiger salamanders were found on the site. He noted that surveys were done in 2007 and 2008 regarding the California tiger salamander and inquired if a document detailing the results has been produced. Ms. Giffin replied that tiger salamanders were not found on the site and that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would have to concur with that finding.

Mr. Kanz then stated that the EIR should look at the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy and examine the mitigation ratios that came out of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's biological opinion for the Santa Rosa Plain. He stated that those mitigation ratios should be applied to this project for the California tiger salamander species. He noted that the California red-legged frog needs to have similar mitigation ratios as the project is in the habitat for those species. He stated that mitigation for the red-legged frog needs to be done on a habitat basis rather than on an individual basis as well.

Mr. Kanz concluded that the Open Space Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative for the project. He indicated that he would also like to see further analysis on other ways of approaching the areas along the creek in order to provide superior wildlife habitat as this is a good riparian source for birds and fish and to create a buffer that would help along that area. He stated that the Alliance will be sending in its written comments on the Draft EIR.

Richard Pugh disclosed that he is affiliated with the Friends of Pleasanton Committee organization and that he was married to a Planning Commissioner. He thanked staff for a detailed document and noted that he would focus on one section. He indicated that he did not

see any information on the types of potential mitigations in Chapter 3.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, regarding their potential impact on wildlife, some of which were listed in Appendix B. He expressed concern for toxic runoff and biological oxygen demand as they are flushed across the property, as well as for emulsions, things with acids, caustics, correlated products, oil from automotive center, breakdown degradation of paving binders, trash particularly on the east side, animal waste potentially in dog parks, animals brought through neighborhood parks and surrounding areas, and the general stormwater runoff listed in Table 3.5-4. He recommended including in the report a recognition of how this can be dealt with. He stated that it is one thing to say in the Report that it might be a problem and another thing to have an analysis of the dimension of the problem and what actually would be required to deal with it, which would provide some visibility to what the level of impact is. He noted that the sources of pollution from animal waste is not often thought of, but it is hazardous material, just as oil that is coming like runoff from automotives that end up in the neighborhood park or the nine-foot deep detention basin, either as residue contaminating the park or the Arroyo. He indicated that he did not see those types of issues called out in the Draft EIR, as well as what other jurisdictions or technologies might considerably be available for adoption by Pleasanton as part of the actual implementation of the community park and the surrounding commercial property. He urged that these issues be given high prominence in the planning, actual execution, and conditions of approval for the project.

John Carroll indicated that he had not had a chance to go through most of the documentation and inquired about the buffer along Arroyo Mocho. He stated that the latest park design revision shows the access road starting on the easternmost section of the Staples Ranch property and actually parallels the Arroyo Mocho fairly closely to the buffer area between the park development and the ice skating facility and the Arroyo. He indicated that he was not sure about the amount of traffic anticipated on the access road and that it was not clear whether or not the traffic study included traffic that the ice facility would actually bring. He expressed concern that the road from the westernmost end of the property to the commercial property would bring in a substantial amount of traffic.

Mr. Carroll noted that the public parking area was located on the far side of ice facility. He stated that bringing cars deep into a park is not his idea of a well-planned park and that he preferred to keep cars, traffic, and access roads to the outside or peripheral area. He noted that he would also like to have a buffer zone between the project development that will take place and the Arroyo Mocho to protect as much of the wild life as possible. He requested that extra caution be taken in the easternmost section of the property where part of the commercial area and the park will be located as this portion has additional importance in terms of the habitat area.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Blank noted that the Commission would review of the Draft EIR, starting with Section 3, Environmental Analysis.

Commissioner Pearce clarified that the Commission would be asking questions and comments on areas it finds potentially inadequate in order to gain more information for the Final EIR. She noted that the Commission should limit itself to this task.

Chair Blank noted that rather than the term “inadequate,” he preferred to say “where the Commission believes more development would be worthwhile having.”

Section 3.1., Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Commissioner Narum inquired where on Figure 3.1-7 the automall freeway sign was located. After a short discussion among the Commissioners, Commissioner Narum was able to locate it on the corner.

Chair Blank noted that there has often been controversy about visuals and that he found the visuals in this document great. He noted that the existing and the proposed have the same exact lens and proportion such that there can be no controversy about which kind of lens was used. He compliment the author who came up with this idea and highly recommended that staff encourage developers who are asked to do visuals to use this methodology as it takes all questions out.

Section 3.2., Air Quality

Chair Blank stated that this section talked about exposure from the Livermore Airport. He indicated that he knows the concentrations of carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons would be addressed but that not a lot of people know that leaded fuel is used in general aviation aircraft. He stated that he would like to make sure that the recommendations for health assessment not be limited to diesel particulates but also address all the health hazards, including lead, that might be potentially involved, especially since the document states that the flying altitude is 800 feet but the FAA says it is 600 feet.

Section 3.3, Biological Resources

There were no comments.

Section 3.4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Referring to page 3.4-5, Other Health and Safety Considerations in the Project Area, Chair Blank stated that he believes about 80 percent of complaints about the Livermore Airport come from houses in Pleasanton. He expressed concern that the reflected impact this project could have on the Livermore Airport has not been looked at. He noted that while the project talks about the Airport Protection Area, it does not talk about the Airport Influence Area. He observed that the noise complaints were coming from the farther side of the Staples Ranch site. He stated that the project is not being proactive enough in the mitigation for the surrounding area.

Chair Blank noted that page 3.4-10, Noise, talks about the 65 dBA noise contour and the part of the project is in the noise contour. He further noted that on page 3.4-19, reference is made to the airplane flight altitude as 800 feet above ground level rather than 1,800 feet earlier mentioned.

Section 3.5, Hydrology and Water Quality

There were no comments.

Section 3.6, Land Use and Agricultural Resources

Chair Blank noted that the document did not address a California bill that has just been introduced and has been either approved by the California Senate or coming before the Senate for signature regarding statewide airport land use policies. He stated that he did not know what its current status is and requested that it be looked into to ensure that it does not contain anything that might be a cause of issue for this project.

Section 3.7, Noise

Chair Blank pointed out that on page 3.7-8, it stated that the Airport Noise Study was done on a Tuesday, which is not necessarily representative in 2006 of operations at the airport today. He noted that there has been a substantial growth in larger aircraft at the airport since 2006 and recommended that further noise studies be done, particularly on Saturday or Sunday as Livermore Airport is a heavy training airport.

Commissioner Narum stated that page 1.5 of the Summary refers to limiting noise levels from the automall carwash stations to 60 dBA at the senior continuing care community facility. She requested that the statement be defined more clearly, e.g., if the 60 dBA is at the property edge.

Commissioner Narum noted that it might not be appropriate to discuss page 3.1 of the Summary on noise at this point; however, it talks about implementing Best Management Practices to reduce construction noise. She stated that it would seem that construction should start on the eastern side to mitigate the western side so that construction vehicles access the property from the east end. Chair Blank agreed and added that with proper mitigation for the noise that the airport generates that would impact the project, the potential complaints that come from the project could be mitigated back toward the airport with the proper types of disclosures. He requested that this issue be looked into.

Commissioner Narum stated that page 4.1 of the Summary talks about using noise attenuating pavements to new portions of Stoneridge Drive. She indicated that she would like to see the impact of the pavement on the Automall Parkway, particularly in vicinity of the community park.

Section 3.8, Population, Employment, and Housing

There were no comments.

Section 3.9, Transportation

Commissioner Narum noted that the statement "Narrow lanes to reduce pedestrian clearance to 20 seconds" on page F-46 on the Summary needs to be clarified.

Section 3.10, Water Supply

There were no comments.

Alternatives

Regarding the traffic analysis on the Ice Center Alternative, Commissioner Pearce stated that on the parking plan for the Ice Center, it appears that major parking is going off of El Charro Road and a sub-parking area off of Stoneridge Drive. She inquired if the traffic study included scenarios such as people pulling in off of Stoneridge Drive and finding no parking in there, go back out to the freeway and come down El Charro Road.

Chair Blank stated that he did not see the question of safety addressed in the traffic study, which only deals with how many dots can get through a certain intersection at a certain time. He would like the question of safety be sufficiently addressed and what the impact could be on the safety of pedestrians or other cars.

Chair Blank stated that this was his fourth EIR since he started on the Planning Commission and that this Draft EIR is one of the most thorough jobs he had seen. He then concluded the public hearing section of the Draft EIR.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

- a. Discussion of the types of projects to be placed on the Consent Calendar.

This item was not discussed.

Overhead Projector

Chair Blank stated that he watched the last City Council meeting, and when a gentleman tried to use the overhead projector, he was told that it was inoperative. He requested staff to look into this matter. Ms. Decker replied that staff would do so.

Commissioner Narum inquired what the status is of the unpainted house at the corner of Peters Avenue and West Angela Avenue. Ms. Decker replied that this house is part of Mike Carey's project for four homes and where the rear portion of the site would be removed. She indicated that the project is currently going through the Building permit process and is in the plan check stage. She noted that the applicants are not doing anything to the house until they get the permits which, they anticipate, they will get shortly.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

- a. **Future Planning Calendar**

No discussion was held or action taken.

b. Actions of the City Council

Commissioner Narum inquired about the outcome of the Tri-Valley Martial Arts appeal. Chair Blank replied that he did not watch the entire meeting.

Commissioner Pearce inquired if the second reading of the Sarich project was continued. Commissioner Narum replied that only four Councilmembers were present at the meeting.

c. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. COMMUNICATIONS

No discussion was held or action taken.

10. REFERRALS

No discussion was held or action taken.

11. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S INFORMATION

a. Brief report on conferences, seminars, and meetings attended by Commission Members

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Blank adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:15 p.m.

A member of the audience spoke up and indicated that this was the first meeting she has attended and that she was interested in the senior community being planned for the Staples Ranch project. She inquired if a tentative schedule was available regarding that project. Chair Blank requested her to give her name, address, and telephone number to staff so she could be included in the distribution list for the project.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary