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Staff Report

Date: June 6, 2018

To: City Council Sitting as the Local Reuse Authority Planning Commission

From: Guy Bjerke, Director, Community Reuse Planning

Prepared by: Joan Ryan, Community Reuse Area Planner
Joan.ryan@cityofconcord.org
(925) 671-3370

Subject: Concord Reuse Project (CRP) Study Session providing: 1) an Update to the North Concord Buffer and District A Green Space; and 2) a Discussion of the Land Use Plan/Program Updates for the CRP

CEQA: This item seeks preliminary review and input on a component of the anticipated Concord Reuse Project Specific Plan, which does not commit the City to a definite course of action on the Specific Plan; rather, it will help shape the project that will be analyzed by the second-tier environmental review and the scope of the analysis. Final decisions regarding the Specific Plan will not take place until the subsequent project-level review is completed. CEQA review will be conducted after a complete draft Specific Plan is developed.

Report in Brief
The joint study session on the Concord Reuse Project (CRP) Specific Plan this evening is being held to accomplish the following:

1) Provide an update to the North Concord buffer and District A green space; and
2) Provide a presentation on the land use plan/program updates for the CRP site.

Staff is seeking review and input on a number of components that will be included within the Draft Specific Plan document. This input does not commit the City to a definite course of action on the Specific Plan; rather, the Planning Commission/City Council and public input will help shape the approach toward these topics that will be defined within
the Specific Plan and analyzed within the second-tier environmental documents. Final decisions regarding the Specific Plan are contingent upon the Specific Plan and subsequent project-level environmental review being completed.

**Recommended Action**
The City Council and Planning Commission are invited to provide direction and feedback regarding: 1) Updates to the North Concord buffer and District A green space; and 2) the land use plan/program updates for the CRP site. The Commission’s and Council’s input will inform the continued drafting of the Specific Plan and related environmental documents.

Staff believes the improved North Concord buffer options and the depiction of the District A green space provide a more accurate context to evaluate the proposed Transit Oriented Development in District A and on the BART Property.

Staff is supportive of the adjustments in the distribution of housing units and product types the master developer has presented in their updated land use plan and program, dated April 19, 2018. The changes address two goals related to affordable housing – ensuring that 25 percent of housing units can be affordable and that affordable housing is distributed throughout the project and not concentrated in one or two of the project’s districts.

**Background**
The 2012 Area Plan was designed with a focus on Transit Oriented Development (TOD), with the North Concord BART station as a focal point. The design was intended to provide residents and workers with practical alternatives to daily automobile use by providing land uses enabling compact development, creating a place that is walkable and bikeable, with ready access to transit within the TOD, as well as throughout the project.

The Area Plan designated the BART site as part of the North Concord TOD Core. The TOD Core anticipated a mix of uses including housing, offices, retail and services, dining and entertainment, hotel, plaza and pocket parks, community facilities, and perhaps a performing arts facility. The Area Plan TOD Core profile included housing of up to a maximum of 20 units/gross acre and designated a range of 60-150 units/net acre. BART has prepared an overall development program that reflects their TOD design guidelines, consistent with the TOD core profile, and is summarized below.

**North Concord BART Development Program – 18 acre site**
- 360 Residential Units; 360 parking spaces;
- 800,000 sq. ft. of commercial (and office) space; 2000 parking spaces;
- Replacement of existing parking spaces for BART users in a parking garage, with up to 1,977 parking spaces; and
- A multi-modal transit plaza.

The Area Plan included an unspecified buffer between TOD at the North Concord BART station and nearby homes. The buffer was intended to provide a transition to the existing neighboring residential development and to provide space for pedestrian and bicycle connections to the station. The TOD neighborhoods offer the greatest opportunity within the site for transit oriented living and walkability, and thus a walking and biking trail to activate the buffer and provide connections to the remainder of the project are critical design components as is the need for sufficient density around the BART station to support the uses described above.

On January 31, 2018, City staff hosted a neighborhood meeting for homeowners and residents within 500 feet of the North Concord BART site to provide them with an opportunity for initial input to BART’s proposed development program at the site. On March 13, the CAC had an opportunity to provide input, as did the Design Review Board, Planning Commission and City Council at their Study Session on April 2.

During the April 2 Study Session two concepts for the BART station reflecting a 25-foot buffer (earlier Option A) and a 45-foot buffer (earlier Option B) were reviewed. The Council direction at the study session was to examine additional ways to provide for a wider green frame buffer to provide additional privacy to existing neighbors living adjacent to the BART site. As a result, the project team has prepared additional concept drawings for further discussion. All options include a central roadway adjacent to the linear open space which the team felt was important to keep visible and ensure it stay active.

One additional option was the concept of a “land swap” between BART and the City to accommodate a wider buffer between existing residents and future development. Staff’s preliminary review found that such a “land swap” could be complicated and expensive, depending upon timing and phasing of development. A “land swap” would effectively result in the trading of BART property that comes with the financial obligation to provide station parking for unburdened land owned by the City/Navy. Further, the Navy would need to be consulted about any impact on value, as part of our negotiation over the Economic Development Conveyance. Staff believes the City should discuss and set a reasonable buffer and apply it in the Specific Plan for North Concord, regardless of property ownership, rather than enter into complicated and lengthy discussions with multiple parties about such a “land swap.”

A portion of the master developer’s land use plan (Phase One) is located adjacent to the northern portion of the BART property. BART anticipates developing their property within a similar timeframe to that of the master developer (for their Phase One development) and anticipates moving forward with a RFP process in the coming months to retain a developer for the site.
A Sun Terrace community leader has called a neighborhood meeting for June 2\textsuperscript{nd} to receive a briefing on the BART site buffer options. The Director of Community Reuse Planning, Guy Bjerke, will attend that meeting and share the input received from the community with the Council and Planning Commission at their June 6\textsuperscript{th} study session.

North Concord Buffer and District A Green Space
Staff worked with FivePoint’s design team to prepare three new options in response to the April 2 feedback. It is important to understand that the BART layout is conceptual and provided to show how the development program could fit on the site. The three options demonstrate a green buffer width of 50 feet (Option A), 75 feet (Option B) and 100 feet (Option C), all holding the development program constant for the BART site. The width of the linear open space is measured between the rear property line for the Dumbarton St. neighbors and the curb of the central roadway. The main building (3.2) shown on Attachment 1, extends beyond that dimensional width, on the other side of the road, as described in the table below.

The differences between the three options are primarily driven by the width of the open space buffer. As the buffer becomes wider, the buildings become taller. In Table 1 below, staff has listed the pros and cons for each of the options, including the differences in acreage for the green buffer, and the resulting heights of buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>BART Parcel – Illustrative Fit Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway: Property line to curb of Roadway</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property line to face of 3.2 building</td>
<td>105 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property line to face of 5.2 building</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 building</td>
<td>6-7 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1/3.2 building</td>
<td>5-6/6 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 3.2 treatment</td>
<td>6 story units facing neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1/5.2 building</td>
<td>3 and 5 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Space (acres)</td>
<td>1.8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional park acreage (Blocks 2.2, 4.2, 5.3)</td>
<td>1.7 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Differences Among BART Site Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit plaza has most generous site plan</td>
<td>• Reduced size of Parcel 6 linear open space along west edge is dominated by “water quality facilities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gives development parcels breathing room to step building massing if desired</td>
<td>• No buffer between Street and existing residential (potential noise, air quality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows big parking garage on Parcel 3.2 to be a half or full floor lower than the other options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows residential on Parcel 3.3 to be a floor lower, and of Type V construction rather than Type III, on the west side facing the existing residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows all structured parking to be wrapped and screened from view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Street is closest to existing residential (acts as buffer to new buildings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows all structured parking to be wrapped and screened from view</td>
<td>• Residential on Parcel 3.3 pushes up to be 7 stories / Type III construction (more expensive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Medium size of Parcel 6 linear open space allows for some recreational use along with “water quality facilities”</td>
<td>• No buffer between Street and existing residential (potential noise, air quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Street is closest to existing residential (acts as buffer to new buildings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expanded size of Parcel 6 linear open space allows for increased recreational use along with “water quality facilities”</td>
<td>• Reduced size/configuration of Transit Plaza begins to reduce design flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Street is closest to existing residential (acts as buffer to new buildings)</td>
<td>• Structured parking is exposed to view on Parcels 3.2 and 5.2 as an impact of reduced parcel sizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff supports a 75-foot buffer (Option B), which balances the desire for privacy with the desire for a viable TOD project overall by:

- Balancing the expanded buffer with the increase in building height.
- Allowing sufficient space for important features of the development: wrapping parking structures with other uses, and providing space for additional landscaping and C3 storm water requirements.
- Limiting ongoing maintenance costs for landscaping and watering.
• Maintaining adequate visibility of the green buffer to reduce the potential for criminal activity.

• Providing a buffer width that can be continued south through the Coast Guard site without overly burdening that site with open space costs, and maintaining open space and connectivity throughout the CRP project.

• Allowing financially viable development types that staff believes are reasonable in the short to mid-term for the project. With a wider buffer, some development would be shifted to taller, more costly steel construction, rather than wood frame.

• Meeting the desire of existing residents for privacy and screening from adjacent buildings.

• The 75 foot buffer (Option B) balances the broad range of competing interests, while generously exceeding the transitional setbacks (between residential and commercial uses) required by the City’s current development standards (requiring setbacks up to a maximum of 40 feet in areas outside the Specific Plan). In addition, staff has brought forward an improved depiction of the green space planned within the TOD District (District A) overall, which better demonstrates the amount of green space and public plazas throughout the District (Attachment 2).

Staff believes the 50-foot buffer (Option A) could also be acceptable with design guidelines that provide ratios limiting building height, based on the distance from the property line. Staff will work with the FivePoint team as the Specific Plan is drafted to explore the potential for a policy to set a ratio of buffer width to building height, tying any increase in building height to an increase in buffer width. The visual impact of such a policy would be evaluated through the technical studies associated with the preparation of the EIR. The 100-foot buffer (Option C) limits design flexibility and increases costs overall based on the type of construction necessary for increased building heights.

Land Use Plan/Program Updates
On November 7, 2017, the CAC reviewed FivePoint’s proposed land use plan and designated it as the plan for the basis of moving forward with the preparation of the Specific Plan, further technical studies and the environmental review. As a result, FivePoint began the additional analysis necessary to write the Specific Plan and Infrastructure Master Plan. In addition, the City initiated a new series of Technical Advisory Committee meetings with the various service providers, and the City’s environmental consultant began the initial study for environmental review of potential impacts from the project.

One of the items FivePoint has been working to address is the requirement that 25% of the housing throughout the project be affordable (Area Plan page 36), as stipulated by Council Resolution 12-4823.3 and within the City’s term sheet with the
master developer. The desire, supported by language in the term sheet, is for affordable units to be dispersed throughout the project area. Affordable housing advocates have indicated that certain locational criteria, like proximity to transit and/or public services, are necessary in order to obtain the state and federal funding necessary to make these affordable projects a reality. The affordable housing developers have also stressed that the delivery of multi-family buildings at densities that fit their management and service models is the key to successful affordable housing projects. In order to achieve these goals, the master developer determined that a shift to incorporate additional market rate multi-family product in the TOD as well as future phases was necessary to create a better mix of affordable and market rate product, providing for a more diverse, mixed income community that balances a range of product types across all phases.

Alternatively, if the percentage of housing units built as multi-family were to remain as originally conceived they would by-in-large all be developed as affordable housing units as the means for achieving the affordable housing goals in the Reuse Plan. This would negate the City’s ability to create mixed-income neighborhoods.

The master developer recognized as they further analyzed additional details and costs of the project associated with infrastructure, affordable housing and their product mix that they would need to make further adjustments to retain a viable and sustainable model across all development phases. At the same time, the developer retains the desire to create an active TOD area centered on the BART station and minimize traffic impacts throughout the project. As a result, FivePoint provided the City with an updated land use plan to address these challenges.

**Revised April 19 Land Use Plan**
The primary changes between the Nov. 7 land use plan and the most recent (April 19) submittal by FivePoint are listed below. The overall unit count remains the same, although Coast Guard units have now been added. However, unit mix among districts has changed. The two land use diagrams showing the two land use plans and development programs are included as Attachments 3 and 4 to this report. The highlighted changes and staff’s explanation include the following:

1. Boundaries have shifted slightly among the districts (12-46 acres)
   - *Necessary to adjust for topography, the Contra Costa Canal and slight adjustments to roadways.*
2. Additional Low Density Residential land use now shown in District J along creek
   - *Incorporated to provide a view site for a larger lot product.*
3. Increased medium density and MU-3 (mixed use) land use parcels are provided along the southern edge of transit spine in Districts E, F, I and J
Necessary to optimize the use of the transit spine, provide viable affordable housing sites throughout the project, and improve viable ridership for shuttle/transit which will utilize the transit spine.

4. Removal of Commercial Office designation in favor of Commercial Flex (Flex).
   - Commercial office designation was removed, but commercial offices would still be allowed within the area designated as MU-1, which provides for a greater flexibility of land uses. The MU-1 district includes a floor area ratio range of 1.0-4.0, more consistent with TOD development, based on proximity to the BART site. Thus, the Commercial Office land use category, which had only one location in the plan previously, has been eliminated. However, square footage within the Campus (increase 800,000 sq. ft.) and Commercial Flex (increased 880,000 sq. ft.) districts have been increased to accommodate this square footage in what the master developer believes will be a marketable area with freeway frontage. The total amount of commercial land-use in the April 19 proposal is the same as that reflected in the November 7 proposal and the 2012 Area Plan.

5. Consolidation in the number of Open Space land use categories from six to four.
   - The number of Open Space acres remain the same, however, the number of land use categories, originally used to assist the team in their planning efforts has been consolidated from six to four. The land use categories being prepared for the Specific Plan will cover a number of types of uses within each category, allowing the consolidation of open space categories.

6. Shift in product mix with an increase in multi-family (now 45%) for Phase One and overall (now 42%)
   - Detailed explanation in analysis section below.

7. Defined split in multifamily with podium (28%) vs. walk-up (17%) for Phase One.
   - Discussed further in analysis section below.

8. Reduction in the single family attached product from 41% to 30% in Phase One.
   - Further discussion in analysis section below.

9. Single family detached product remains the same for Phase One (25%), but decreases overall from 34% to 27%.
   - Further discussion in analysis section below.

10. Change of Commercial flex land use in District G to OS-2 (District and Citywide Parks).
    - Necessary to accommodate storm water retention water quality basin, along Mt. Diablo Creek.
Analysis
Since the CAC’s designation of the Nov. 7 plan for further study, the master developer has been conducting further market and feasibility studies in addition to proceeding with further work on infrastructure and transportation planning. In addition, the developer has been working to ensure that the project can be:

- staged and phased to provide a broad product mix designed to provide a comprehensive and diverse community marketable to a wide-range of buyers to attract buyers both within Concord and the greater Bay Area;
- shaped to facilitate success with sites that support affordable developers’ ability to achieve funding for future projects for a broad community of residents including teachers, seniors, veterans, disabled and the homeless;
- planned to be supportive of transit and the multi-modal goals of the project; and
- optimized in a manner in which the product unit mix and land uses work together taking into account the balance of a number of variables including economics, staging within each phase, product mix and an equitable disbursement of affordable units throughout the entire project site.

As a result, the developer has made the following modifications to their overall product mix, with a desire toward retaining the overall mix of land uses, as previously shown in the Nov. 7 plan, to the greatest extent possible.

Multi-family Shift in Product Mix
The master developer’s revised land use program includes a shift in product mix resulting in an increase of multi-family units as follows: 1) Phase 1 from 34% to 45%; and 2) overall from 26% to 42%. This was due in large part for the need to: 1) place more multi-family housing in close proximity to the TOD and Town Center to increase densities and bolster future funding potential for affordable housing; 2) increase the multi-family units in proximity to the transit spine to bolster ridership; and 3) increase market rate multi-family housing to provide a better mix of affordable/market rate multi-family housing throughout the site. One additional point is that the Nov. 7 Land Use Plan did not include the 800 units on the Coast Guard site, anticipated to be a mix of multi-family walk-up (400) and single family attached units.

To understand the proposed shift in multi-family requirements associated with the revised plan, it is important to review the project requirements, per the term sheet for affordable housing, as these requirements included the following:

- An overall 25% affordable housing requirement at 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) or below;
- A requirement for the units to be distributed throughout the project;
• A need for the units to be located within proximity of transit (BART and bus) and amenities to facilitate non-profit affordable developers in obtaining future funding for the projects; and

• Accommodation of homeless units with access to services/transit.

Table 2 shown below provides a summarized comparison between the unit mix originally anticipated within the 2012 Area Plan, the product mix shown within the Nov. 7, 2017 land use plan and the mix recently provided within the Apr. 19, 2018 land use plan, submitted by Five Point. An important item to note is that the Coast Guard units were not included within the earlier Nov. 7, 2017 plan. Also, the Area Plan, previously included a category that included a mix of single family detached and attached units (25%) providing for flexibility into the future. The Area Plan acknowledged that future planning (the Specific Plan) would further detail the product mix at the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>3,050 (25%)</td>
<td>3,150 (26%)</td>
<td>5,419 (42%)</td>
<td>2,269 (42%)</td>
<td>2,369 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>4,880 (40%)</td>
<td>4,910 (40%)</td>
<td>4,056 (31%)</td>
<td>-854 (31%)</td>
<td>-824 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mix SF</td>
<td>3,050 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,050 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>1,220 (10%)</td>
<td>4,140 (34%)</td>
<td>3,525 (27%)</td>
<td>-615 (27%)</td>
<td>2,305 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>800 (Coast Guard)</td>
<td>800 (Coast Guard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 4/19/2018 includes Coast Guard units. Area Plan and 11/7/2017 totals do not include Coast Guard Property.

The rationale for the increase in multi-family product within the site includes the following:

• The Area Plan previously assumed 25% of the housing product overall would be multi-family. Yet, the majority of affordable housing product needs to be multi-family product, based on the development and service program of most affordable developers, typical funding requirements, and the necessity for access to transit and services to acquire funding. But, it is not reasonable or marketable to assume that all of the multifamily housing would be an affordable product.
Thus, there is a need for additional multifamily housing that is market rate product.

- There is a necessity for an overall mix of product types (affordable and market rate) within Phase One and overall for the project, which is essential to meet the City’s desire for housing communities that provide for a diverse mix of residents and incomes, disbursed throughout the project. The greater variety of product types is important to assist in achieving more timely absorption of the housing within each of the phases in the project area.

- Thus, in order to enhance the marketability and timely absorption of units within the development, a greater number of multi-family units were necessary. The product mix was determined based on the market demand anticipated from the various market segments, based on the research conducted. As a result, 617 multi-family units have been added to District A (TOD).

- The development pads for affordable units envision podium/walk-up multi-family product in order to create financeable developments that are competitive in receiving tax-credit financing. In addition, 80/20 buildings (80% market rate/20% affordable) in podium/walk-up buildings need to be in proximity to transit/amenities to be financially feasible.

- Inclusionary units would still be incorporated into projects, per the term sheet, in single-family products to ensure affordable units are mixed with and distributed throughout the project.

Delineation of Multi-family Product Mix

The master developer has further defined the multi-family product mix anticipated for each phase of the project, distinguishing between a podium product and walk-up product, for those areas within the Mixed Use-districts. The split has been defined for Phase One as podium product (28%) and walk-up product (17%) with the split for the overall project as podium (21%) and walk-up (21%). The podium product is intended for greater use when closer to the TOD with the walk-up product increasing in the later phases of the project. Podium-style projects are becoming more common today in denser areas, and are typically a multi-level building that sits over a podium which incorporates the parking levels, as a way to combine units efficiently with a parking solution. The developer will be providing examples of each within their presentation.

Reduction in Single Family Attached Product

The single family attached product has been reduced for phase one from 41% to 30% and overall from 40% to 31% from the earlier November 7, 2017 land use plan. The single family attached product was reduced to accommodate greater multi-family product, but is still a housing product found within most of the districts and primarily within District D (Olivera), District G (Town Center), and District J (Bailey).
Single family Detached Product
Single family detached product remains the same for Phase 1 (25%) but decreases overall from 34% (Phase One) to 29.3% overall. The additional Coast Guard housing does not include single family detached housing and thus does not have a bearing on the reduction in units. Most of the single family detached unit reductions occur in Districts C (Transit Adjacent South), D (Olivera) and J (Bailey). However, increases in single family detached are now shown in Districts E (WP North), F (WP South), G (Town Center) and I (Brubeck).

Summary of Land Use Plan/Program Adjustments
The original Area Plan itself acknowledges the need for flexibility in unit types, The proposed Land Use Plan revisions advance the overarching goals, objectives, and policies of the Area Plan and are consistent therewith. Staff supports the adjustments the master developer has presented based on their revised land use plan and program, dated April 19, based on the rationale provided, and staff’s analysis of the shifts in the unit numbers and product types. Staff notes that the developer team is crafting language for the Specific Plan, which the City will review, to ensure equitable distribution of development across the site over all development phases, while still maintaining some flexibility to ensure potential to adapt to changing markets and trends over time.

Staff believes that the implementation details for inclusion within the Specific Plan land use, development standards and implementation chapters will be important and necessary to ensure that:

- Overdevelopment does not occur within any of the districts, due to the broad density and intensity ranges provided for many of the land use categories, and that sufficient capacity is available for later development phases within the overall development cap established in the Area Plan (with additional Coast Guard units).

- Flexibility is allowed, but limited, to ensure housing generally stays on pace with the overall program, and to ensure that affordable housing is built on pace with market rate units to retain a diverse housing mix.

- Housing is coordinated with the development of the transit spine and shuttle services to ensure long-time viability of ridership.

Based upon the feedback received from tonight’s study session, the team will work to incorporate direction received and continue on with the preparation of the Specific Plan and Initial Study, providing updates on the team’s progress throughout the remainder of the year.
Recent CAC Meetings and Public Input

Recent CAC Meetings
The CAC met at their regular meeting on April 17, where the presentation on Environmental Permitting was provided. Attachment 5 includes the approved minutes from that meeting.

The CAC met at their regular meeting on May 15 and discussed the land use plan/program updates. Overall, most of the CAC was open to the proposed land use plan, as long as commercial square footage remains the same, and recognizing that the increase in multi-family units may be necessary in order to achieve the goals of providing a diverse mix of unit types and income levels for better affordable unit integration. While the proposal did raise some concerns, described below, staff responded to these issues (italics below) and will continue addressing through the planning process. Some of the comments included the following:

- Will the elimination in the commercial office designation eliminate jobs?
  - No, commercial square footage remains the same.

- Is a hotel being looked at as part of the commercial?
  - Yes, two hotels are being assumed.

- Having more multi-family along the transit spine seems to make sense.
  - Yes, higher density along the spine will be supportive of ridership over the phases of the project.

- Want more green space near BART.
  - Options are being prepared and will be shared and reviewed by the Planning Commission/City Council.

- Want to ensure there is enough parking in the TOD area and others with multifamily housing.
  - Staff is coordinating through the preparation of the Specific Plan.

Neighborhood Meetings
Attachment 6 provides the summary minutes from the neighborhood meetings held on April 26, April 30, and May 2. A new neighborhood meeting has just been scheduled for June 2nd; staff will verbally share the outcomes of that meeting at the June 6th Study Session.

Financial Impact
No General Funds will be required for this project. Preparation of the Draft Specific Plan is being funded by the Master Developer for the project, and City staff time and consultants are being covered, based on the agreed term sheet through a reimbursement agreement with the Master Developer.
Specific Plan Environmental Determination
The Specific Plan involves the implementation of the Area Plan and, therefore, the CEQA process will be informed by the program-level EIR and addendum previously prepared for the Area Plan. An initial study is currently being prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants, the City’s CEQA consultant, which will lead to a project-level Specific Plan EIR to provide a thorough and independent review of the Specific Plan. SWCA will continue preparation of environmental documents during 2018.

This agenda item seeks preliminary review and input on a component of the anticipated Specific Plan, which does not commit the City to a definite course of action on the Specific Plan; rather, it will help shape the project that will be analyzed by the second tier environmental review and the scope of analysis. Final decisions regarding the Specific Plan will not take place until the subsequent project-level environmental review is completed.

Public Contact
The Agenda was posted. The City Council/Planning Commission Study Session was announced on the Concord Reuse Project website and notification went out to those who have signed up for notifications on the Concord Reuse Project website. The City Council/Planning Commission study session was also announced at the May 15 CAC meeting.

Attachments
1. North Concord buffer options, dated May 29, 2018
2. TOD Illustrative Plan - District A enlargement, dated May 25, 2018
3. April 19, 2018, Land Use Plan:
   a. Land Use Plan, Sheet 2
   b. Project Districts and Phases, Sheet 5
   c. Dev. Program Allocated by Phase/District, Sheet 6
5. April 17, 2018, CAC Approved Summary Minutes
6. April and May 2018 Neighborhood Meeting Summary
### PROGRAM - PLAN A - 105' SETBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback from edge of existing parking lot</th>
<th>Plan A – 105' Setback</th>
<th>Plan B – 130' Setback</th>
<th>Plan C – 155' Setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units/Parking Spaces</td>
<td>360/360</td>
<td>360/360</td>
<td>360/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Sq. Ft./Parking Spaces</td>
<td>800,000/2,000</td>
<td>800,000/2,000</td>
<td>800,000/2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART parking</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>1,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park acreage (Blocks 2.2, 4.2, 5.3)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear open space acreage</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building heights near existing homes</td>
<td>3-7 stories</td>
<td>3-7 stories</td>
<td>3-7 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall building heights</td>
<td>3-7 stories</td>
<td>3-7 stories</td>
<td>3-8 stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Features

**General Pro/Con observation:**

As the setback becomes wider, the decreasing remaining real estate requires taller, more expensive ($/psf) buildings to fit the same program.

The benefits – a wider buffer open space – are limited in the context of City and Regional open space resources.

**PROS**

- Transit plaza has most generous site plan
- Gives development parcels breathing room to step building massing if desired
- Allows big parking garage on Parcel 3.2 to be a half or full floor lower than the other options
- Allows residential on Parcel 3.3 to be a floor lower, and of Type V construction rather than Type III, on the west side facing the existing residential
- Allows all structured parking to be wrapped and screened from view
- Street is closest to existing residential (acts as buffer to new buildings)

**CONS**

- Reduced size of Parcel 6 linear open space along west edge is dominated by “water quality facilities”
- No buffer between Street and existing residential (noise, air quality)

**PROS**

- Allows all structured parking to be wrapped and screened from view
- Medium size of Parcel 6 linear open space allows for some recreational use along with “water quality facilities”
- Street is closest to existing residential (acts as buffer to new buildings)

**CONS**

- Residential on Parcel 3.3 pushes up to be part 7 stories / Type III construction (more expensive)
- No buffer between Street and existing residential (noise, air quality)

**PROS**

- Expanded size of Parcel 6 linear open space allows for increased recreational use along with “water quality facilities”
- Street is closest to existing residential (acts as buffer to new buildings)

**CONS**

- Reduced size/configuration of Transit Plaza begins to reduce design flexibility
- Structured parking is exposed to view on Parcels 3.2 and 5.2 as an impact of reduced parcel sizes
- Residential on Parcel 3.3 pushes up to be part 7 stories / Type III construction and part 8 stories / Type I construction (more expensive)
- No buffer between Street and existing residential (noise, air quality)
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### Project Districts and Phases

#### PHASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Total AC</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Net AC</th>
<th>Net AC</th>
<th>Target DU</th>
<th>DU/AC Range</th>
<th>Net AC</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>ROW AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>North Concord TOD</td>
<td>158.3</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>10 - 150</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,103,810</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>10 - 100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Olivera</td>
<td>208.5</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>10 - 45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Willow Pass North</td>
<td>184.1</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>2 - 45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Willow Pass South</td>
<td>205.6</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>6 - 45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>196.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>6 - 100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>371,190</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Brueck</td>
<td>260.4</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>6 - 45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>271.7</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>2 - 45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>City-Wide Open Space</td>
<td>171.1</td>
<td>II, III</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>171.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creek Corridor and East Parcels</td>
<td>225.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SPECIFIC PLAN AREA</strong></td>
<td>2,326.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>323.5</td>
<td>653.7</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>178.3</td>
<td>7,600,000</td>
<td>786.6</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>274.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Residential dwelling unit count includes residential dwelling units from Mixed Use areas. Distribution of dwelling units across districts is approximate.
2. Commercial square feet includes commercial from Mixed Use areas. Commercial distribution across Districts is approximate.
3. School Joint-Use Playfields and In-tract Open Space are not included in open space totals. This would require double counting.
4. SF - square feet; DU/AC - Dwelling units per acre; FAR - Floor to area ratio.
**Concord Reuse Project Specific Plan**

**Estimate of Development Program Allocated by Phase and District**

**PHASE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial / Campus</th>
<th>Totals All Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Obrella</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Train Center</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Bruckb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Total</strong></td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District** | **Project** | **Residential** | **Commercial / Campus** | **Totals All Phases** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Obrella</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Train Center</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Bruckb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Total</strong></td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District** | **Project** | **Residential** | **Commercial / Campus** | **Totals All Phases** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Obrella</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Train Center</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Bruckb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Total</strong></td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District** | **Project** | **Residential** | **Commercial / Campus** | **Totals All Phases** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Obrella</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Train Center</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Bruckb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Total</strong></td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Program sources: Area Plan Volume One Residential Program (page 40); FivePoint 9/17/2017 Community Program + 2,300 Campus site, 2/27/18 community program update, 4/18/18 FivePoint residential program update, November 2017 BART confirmation of program.
2. Phase II includes 360 BART dwelling units in District A. Phase II includes 800 Coast Guard dwelling units in Districts C (400 DU) and District D (400 DU).
3. MF Multi-family, SFA Single Family Attached, SFD Single Family Detached, SFD Large Single Family Attached Large Lot (See note (b) Sheet 7).
### Concord Reuse Plan

**Land Use and Program Summary by District**

**Concord Reuse Project**

**Concord, California**

**Program and Land Use Summaries**

**November 7, 2017**

**Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Total AC</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Net AC</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial/Campus</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Civic/Schools</th>
<th>Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>North Concord TOD</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>18 - 150</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>120.3</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 - 100</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>135.3</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>18 - 100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>220.6</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>6 - 30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Willow Pass North</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>6 - 30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Willow Pass South</td>
<td>214.8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>135.5</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>6 - 30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>211.8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>10 - 45</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 - 45</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Brubeck</td>
<td>272.8</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>150.1</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>6 - 30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>313.7</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>135.9</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>6 - 30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>City-Wide Open Space</td>
<td>278.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Site** 2,272.2 acres

---

**District Residential Commercial/Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>314.7 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Olivia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Town Center</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Brubeck</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City-Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase Total** 1,500 | 1,500 | 4,500 | 2,000 | 300 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |

**% Breakdown** 33% | 33% | 22% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% |

**District Commercial/Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>274.7 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Olivia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Town Center</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Brubeck</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City-Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase Total** 2,250 | 2,250 | 4,500 | 8,000 | 5,775,000 | 11,000 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 2,000 |

**% Breakdown** 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% | 57% | 0% | 12% | 0% | 100% |

---

**District Residential Commercial/Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE III</th>
<th>778.8 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Olivia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Town Center</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Brubeck</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City-Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase Total** 3,150 | 4,910 | 4,140 | 12,200 | 6,780,000 | 535,000 | 820,000 | 265,000 | 8,400,000 |

**% Breakdown** 40% | 40% | 30% | 30% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% | 60% |

---

**District Commercial/Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTALS ALL PHASES</th>
<th>2,272.2 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Concord TOD</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Campus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Transit Adjacent South</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Olivia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willow Pass North</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Willow Pass South</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Town Center</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Gateway</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Brubeck</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bailey</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K City-Wide Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase Total** 3,150 | 4,910 | 4,140 | 12,200 | 6,780,000 | 535,000 | 820,000 | 265,000 | 8,400,000 |

**% Breakdown** 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% | 57% | 0% | 12% | 0% | 100% |

Note: Program sources: Area Plan Volume One Residential Program (page 40); FivePoint 9/6/2017 Commercial Program + 2.3m Campus site

---

**Concord Reuse Plan**

**Estimate of Development Program Allocated by Project Phase and District**

**Program Totals** 3,150 | 4,910 | 4,140 | 12,200 | 6,780,000 | 535,000 | 820,000 | 265,000 | 8,400,000
MISSION STATEMENT - *Apply the Reuse Project Goals and Guiding Principles, adopted Reuse Area Plan policies, and accepted Term Sheet provisions in evaluating and commenting on potential Specific Plan alternatives or issues. The CAC shall also serve as a communication link between the Reuse Project and the community-at large by assisting in targeting outreach to neighborhoods and interest groups, and promoting participation at workshops and public meeting.*

Information for the public on participation at Committee meetings can be found on the back of the Speaker Identification Card located near the Council Chamber entrance. Should you have any questions after consulting the Speaker Identification Card, please contact Pamela Laperchia prior to the Committee meeting.

**AGENDIZED ITEMS** – The public is entitled to address the Committee on items appearing on the agenda before or during the Committee’s consideration of that item. Each speaker will be limited to approximately three minutes.

1. **OPENING**

   **Roll Call** – Philip Arnold, Randall Horton, Niko Anagnostopoulos, Colleen Geraghty, Claudia Hein, Charles Hoffman, Jerome Hudson, Ajit Kaushal, Rosanne Nieto, Stuart Posselt, Paul Sinz, Peggy Tweedie, Darrin Walters, Steve Older and Julie Dennler Marquardt present.

   **Pledge to the Flag** – Led by Randall Horton

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

   This is a fifteen minute Public Comment Period for items within the Committee’s subject matter jurisdiction that are not on this agenda. Each speaker will be limited to approximately three minutes. State law prohibits the Committee from acting at this meeting on any matter raised during the Public Comment Period.

   **Hope Johnson** – Ms. Johnson encouraged everyone to research the new information about the false reporting by Tetra Tech at Hunter’s Point. She stated there is a possibility there would be a containment area near Bailey Road associated with the tear
down of the bunkers. In San Francisco, none of the elected officials and none of the
watchdog boards that were appointed made any mention of what was going on until it
was clear the Navy was not going to be able to transfer over the land. There is an
ongoing investigation on some land where housing was already built. Urge you to take
time to look that up because it will affect what we can build here, as residents I would
hope that would be a concern for you. We can’t wait for elected officials to step up and
we have to step up now because it is clear the procedures these exact same parties
had in place are not working out there, and we want to make sure they are working
here. Ms. Johnson would also like to see someone from the City and/or Lennar attend
the quarterly RAB meetings.

**Natalie** – Natalie pointed out the City will be working with the EPA but keep in mind we
are working with Trump’s EPA.

**Susanne Delbou** – Ms. Delbou expressed concern about what happened at Hunter’s
Point isn’t going to happen on our property. She advised the CAC to pay close attention
to this issue.

**Rich Eber** – Mr. Eber stated he takes a strong position against Lennar and is
concerned about possible criminal negligence in San Francisco.

### 3. COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ITEMS

The public is entitled to address the Committee on items appearing on the agenda before or during the Committee’s
consideration of that item. Each speaker will be limited to approximately three minutes.

#### A. Approval of March 13, 2018 annotated minutes.

Minutes for the March 13, 2018 meeting were approved by a motion from Claudia
Hein and Jim Hoffman seconded the motion. Stuart Posselt abstained.

#### B. Site Permitting and Coordination with State and Regional Agencies

- **Site Permitting and Coordination, Dahlia Chazan, Associate Principal with ARUP**

- **Public Comment**

  **Hope Johnson** – Ms. Johnson is concerned with one blanket permit being
  sought for the whole development area. She feels the project process should
  be reviewed by an entity that would have some say over the project, some
  protection as the phases go forward.

  **Susan Delbou** – Ms. Delbou questioned why additional land needs to be
  purchased for endangered species.

- **CAC Discussion of Site Permitting**

  - Who will be maintaining the creeks and ponds? Who will be paying for the
    upkeep?
• Do all agencies require a permit?
• Is there a possibility of change in requirements down the line? Will the City have to come up with more money?
• A plan to issue all permits together and have one source is a critical piece for planning and preservation piece
• How many protected wetlands are in our area? Which wetlands are under the City and which are EBRPD?
• What is the historic property within the EDC? What mitigation is being done?
• Is there a plan in case something else is found?
• Can we recommend an independent testing agency conduct testing? Is there an alternative, do we have a work around?
• Are they using the same testing on the wetlands as the rest of the site?

C. Next Steps/CAC questions

Upcoming meetings/activities

- April 26 – Neighborhood Meeting- Bishop Estates; 6:30 pm
- April 30 – Neighborhood Meeting – Dana Estates; 6:30 pm
- May 2 – Neighborhood Meeting – Monument Neighborhood; 7:30 pm
- May 15 – CAC meeting - Community Facilities Districts Financing
- May 19 – Public bus tours to CNWS: 9am and noon
- June 6 – Planning Commission/City Council Study Session
- June 19 – No CAC meeting
- July 17 – CAC meeting
- July 28 – Public bus tours to CNWS: 9am and noon

4. ADJOURNMENT – 7:15p

Next Meeting: May 15, 2018 – 6:00 p.m.

ADA NOTICE AND HEARING IMPAIRED PROVISIONS - The Council Chamber is equipped with Easy Listener Sound Amplifier units for use by the hearing impaired. The units operate in conjunction with the Chamber’s sound system. You may request the Easy Listener Phonic Ear Personal Sound Amplifier from the City Clerk for personal use during Council meetings.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and California Law, it is the policy of the City of Concord to offer its public programs, services and meetings in a manner that is readily accessible to everyone, including those with disabilities. If you are disabled and require a copy of a public hearing notice, or an agenda and/or agenda packet in an appropriate alternative format; or if you require other accommodation, please contact the ADA Coordinator at (925) 671-3031, at least five days in advance of the hearing. Advance notification within this guideline will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.
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To: Joan Ryan, City of Concord  Date: May 9, 2018
Copies: Guy Bjerke, City of Concord  Reference number: 251780
From: Dahlia Chazan, Audrey Shiramizu, Arup  File reference: 09-04
Subject: Summary of Community Input from Specific Plan Neighborhood Meetings

Background

This memo summarizes community feedback received on comment cards and verbally during the three Specific Plan Neighborhood Meetings in April and May 2018. These meetings were open to the public but focused on residents in the Bishop Estates, Dana Estates, and Monument neighborhoods. Approximately 53,000 postcard mailers were sent citywide to Concord households (owners and occupants) making them aware of the three meeting options; additionally, approximately 4,600 Spanish language postcards were sent.

1 Summary

While each neighborhood provided feedback specific to their community, there were common themes from the meetings.

- **Transportation and traffic**: There is general concern about traffic, particularly on freeways and the potential impacts on local and collector streets. Homeowners are concerned about traffic impacts on property values. There was also feedback about improving bicycle and pedestrian facilities and timely transit service to relieve congestion and improve access.
- **BART property**: Residents near the North Concord BART Station are concerned about the site development options and their privacy.
- **Housing**: There is consensus that more affordable housing is needed and that access to housing should be inclusive (persons with disabilities/experiencing homelessness).
- **Jobs**: Feedback echoed the need for local job requirements and vocational/technical skills schools, especially focused on women, youth, persons experiencing homelessness, and other special groups.
- **Infrastructure**: More detail is needed on infrastructure and utilities, including water sources, electricity, and ensuring sustainable practices.
2 Neighborhood Meeting #1 – Bishop Estates – 4/26/18

Following are summarized comments based on the comment cards submitted by meeting participants.

- **Jobs**: Local hire requirement for construction was a high priority for commenters. Should also consider a local hire requirement for permanent jobs. Vocational schools and training to make Concord a “world-class” city and self-sufficient is important. Consider placing medical marijuana facilities onsite.

- **Housing**: Affordable housing options should also be inclusive for individuals with disabilities.

- **Transportation**: Homeowners worry that increased traffic will affect property values. Other concerns included the need for traffic improvements on Port Chicago Highway and users cutting-through neighborhoods to bypass traffic on Highway 242 to Highway 4.

- **BART property**: Residents near the BART property are concerned about their privacy.

3 Neighborhood Meeting #2 – Dana Estates – 4/30/18

Following are summarized comments based on the comment cards submitted by meeting participants.
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- **Transportation:** General concern about people cutting-through neighborhoods, increased traffic (particularly on Highway 242 and Willow Pass Road). Suggestion to increase pedestrian/bike-only access to the site to encourage these modes.

- **Education:** Need a variety of schools (K-12, public and private). Tech/vocational schools are as important as 4-year universities – they can help people experiencing homelessness get back into the workplace.

- **Infrastructure:** More detail needed on infrastructure and utilities, including water sources and electricity.

- **Veteran's hall:** Interest in a Veteran’s Hall and identifying a location for it.

- **Homelessness:** Should create centers for persons experiencing homelessness, especially single mothers and families.

- **Jobs:** Focus on training women, youth, and special groups in construction.

4 Neighborhood Meeting #3 – Monument – 5/2/18

Following are summarized comments based on the comment cards submitted by meeting participants.

- **Transportation:** General concern about traffic impact (particularly Highway 242 and Interstate 680) and effect on housing values. Interest in better access to freeways, more access roads, and better CCCTA service to North Concord BART. Concern about who will pay for the circulator shuttle.

- **Housing:** More affordable housing. Concern about developers building and adding stories without permit approval.

- **Marketing and project transparency:** Concern about previous work by Tetra Tech and Lennar on remediation and base redevelopment.

- **BART property:** Residents near BART property are concerned about their privacy.

- **Infrastructure:** Push for sustainable infrastructure (e.g. gray water systems, drip systems, fountains with recycled water, solar, and low-flow fixtures and on-demand hot water systems).
5 Summary Meeting Minutes

Following are summary minutes for each Neighborhood meeting.

Neighborhood meeting – April 26; Approximately 80 Attendees
Bishop Estates at Mormon Church on Denkinger Rd.; 6:30 pm

1. What will happen to the eucalyptus trees? They are not native, so they will probably be replaced when development occurs at the site.

2. Will Panoramic go through to Willow Pass Road? Not directly, but yes.

3. What types of jobs will the base have? Are these low paying retail jobs? Due to the proximity to BART and the office commercial planned for within the TOD, we expect that these will be higher paying jobs, but will depend on the job sectors that locate in those areas. The jobs ratios stem from office/retail square footages and are based on standard ratios. The project team is aware of and keeping an eye on the trends associated with diminishing retail.

4. What is the amount of traffic associated with the project? The project team has prepared a model, with input from the City, and the City has retained its own traffic consultant to conduct additional data collection, review the model and develop trip generation numbers to determine transportation-related project impacts.

5. BART is at capacity already, are there plans to create capacity? Yes, BART is working to provide upgrades to computer systems to allow more frequent trains, as well as adding train cars to the system. In addition, the creation of a TOD project at the North Concord BART station with the development of offices and jobs in close proximity to the station would provide a demand for reverse commute of traffic and trains from the south (and west) and could potentially also limit the amount of traffic continuing on from the east, once a new job hub is created.

6. Is there a minimum? Can we decrease the unit count? Eventual number of units and the pace of units will in the end be tied to market demand. The overall Area Plan was approved after lengthy and comprehensive public input and the regional agencies that oversee housing and transportation support the project which has been designated a priority development area by those agencies (Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments).

7. Has a transit village been considered? Yes, that is what is being planned within the larger TOD area.

8. What will this project do to my taxes? One of the goals of the plan was for it to be fiscally neutral and pay for itself. This would be done through a variety of community facilities districts and/or infrastructure facilities districts and HOA dues.

9. Lennar when will they know the lay out and plans for units/town homes? We are a ways off from that, currently only working on the master planning aspect via the Specific Plan. Actual floor plans and project plans would not occur for a few years.
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10. What percentage of plan is open space? Approximately 69% of the project would include open space including the regional park, tournament sports park, city park, smaller local parks and trails throughout the project. Parkland at base would essentially double the current parkland.

11. What is the plan to address schools? The project is anticipated to have 3-4 elementary schools a middle school and perhaps a high school or funding toward a high school. School planning is based on student generation numbers; there has been coordination with MDUSD which continues. High school could also have a work training component as the campus district planning evolves.

12. Affordable housing – is it being included? Yes, there is a 25% commitment. Would be dispersed throughout with all income levels on the base. Sites would be developed via a RFP or NOFA process providing opportunities to well respected, non-profit housing developers.

13. How is homeless housing being fit in? Homeless Assisted housing (135 units) would be built a portion of which can be built off-site, and services will be partnering. This was a requirement of the transfer of the land. In coordination, the Contra Costa food bank is anticipated to build a new facility which could include job training/jobs in coordination with the housing.

14. Performing Arts Center was mentioned at one time–what is plan? Could occur on campus, as part of the educational component, providing such an amenity to multiple users.

15. What is being considered for the veterans? Veterans have requested the desire for a facility and are considering what they need in terms of size, location and funding available.

16. CSU East Bay is a 4 year college, what would happen? The CSU site has topo and geologic issues that would prevent much expansion. Proximity to a transit station, such as BART at North Concord is preferred.

17. CCWD is there enough water? Yes, they have indicated they can serve.

18. Would housing be offered to local people first? No, housing would be available and open to all. There may be certain affordable housing projects limited to seniors, or veterans for example, but market rate housing would be open.

19. Acreage – how large is first phase? Approximately 500 acres.

20. Traffic is a concern with limited access to freeway – Yes there are two interchanges available for the project to access Highway 4. Improvement/extension of Evora Road would provide additional flexibility to access. Project will contribute to intersection improvements based on its fair share, as a result of the traffic study impacts determined.

21. Landscaping should be planted with trees to support wildlife.

22. Campus – before building are we partnering? Yes, this is what the initial Blue Ribbon Committee is about and that process will run parallel to the Specific Plan process.

23. BART had shown an A or B option at the Holbrook neighborhood meeting, what was decided? We have gone back to the drawing board, based on CAC, City Council comments and will be bringing forward some new concepts.

24. Fire Dept locations? Yes, two are proposed: one in the first responder training area; and a second in District 1 or J.
25. Parking is not being expanded at BART? BART will be replacing the parking there now and providing additional parking for the residential and commercial built, but there are no plans to build additional BART parking. The concept of the project is to encourage residents to utilize transit, walk or bike to utilize the station.


27. Will there be gas stations and grocery? Yes there will be such services as well as charging stations. What do you see as the best and worst part of project? Campus district and Tournament Sports Park have a lot of potential. Traffic will be a challenge and we will need to do our best to limit it.

8:10 pm close

Neighborhood meeting – April 30; Approximately 63 Attendees
Dana Estates at First Lutheran Church on 4000 Concord Blvd.; 6:30 pm
1. Port Chicago will have lots of impacts due to the project. Yes, we expect so, the traffic study will soon be under way.

2. Campus project is still in process, is there time to give input? Yes, the Blue Ribbon Committee will be formed and a number of different approaches to the campus will be considered which will have its own, open and parallel process.

3. Would CSU on Ygnacio Valley Road move? No, not necessarily, but that campus is constrained physically due to topography and grades.

4. Sewage and Water will be needed; why is the plan so spread out, it will have lots of costs, including for police and fire and so many roads? Staff has been coordinating with both the Contra Costa Water District and the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District in terms of the needs for those services. The City is proceeding with a plan that was studied through many community outreach meetings during 2009-2012. The plan is supported by MTC, ABAG, since the site is a priority development area that the State and regional agencies are looking toward to accommodate the region’s growth. Funding considerations are beginning to be examined and May 15 CAC will provide a high level overview regarding funding mechanisms.

5. Did surrounding community get any parts of the base? The site is completely within the City limits of Concord, so the base and planning for the base are within Concord. However, Pittsburg is planning separately for homes east of the regional park.

6. Willow Pass Road- will it be expanded to 4 lanes? The current plan is to expand to four lanes, but the traffic study will study what is necessary there. In addition, WPR on the base, will not exist as it is currently, one the bridge over the railroad will no longer be needed, so it will be closer to at grade, while still allowing for pedestrians and bikes to go under near the creek. In addition, WPR will have 6-7 intersections along that stretch of road, some signalized, some stop signs, as determined by study, so it will be much different than currently exists.
7. Traffic is a major concern. Traffic in existing Concord has gotten much worse, distances that used to take 5 minutes to drive now take 15, with this project it will get worse. The development is anticipated to occur over 30 years, so it will not occur all at once. We are relying on a distributed traffic network to disperse traffic with a heavy focus on providing opportunities on pedestrian, biking and transit opportunities and the provision of jobs to allow people to stay more within the community.

8. Affordable housing leads to more traffic since there are often more people living in those units, what is considered affordable? Much of the affordable housing will be located within proximity to transit so those non-profit developers can achieve the funding necessary. The City made the commitment in 2012 of 25% affordable units to low income households.

9. How many units will be in the first phase? 4,400 units over 8-10 years.

10. I see an emphasis on bikes, bus and walking, but people like their cars, how will people get around? What is the timing of other projects such as when will Highway 4 be widened. The project proposes a distributed street network throughout the project with connections to all of the major arterials and additional local streets in the case of West St. and Denkinger which are not proposed to be expanded and would not be connected for probably 10 years. CalTrans is continuing their planning for the Highway 4 expansion and the project will provide its fair share funding to a variety of projects based on the outcome of the traffic study and consultation and coordination with local agencies.

11. Will the Tournament Sports Park (TSP) pay for itself? It may be private operators; the City is just embarking on a process to determine what type of facility it should be in terms of number and types of fields, so the financing is one component that will need to be examined over the year.

12. Any discussion of Levi Stadium or similar? Not at this time, think it will be the TSP direction, but if approached the City would take a look at it.

13. Where will the water come from? Contra Costa Water District has indicated that it can serve the project.

14. What about schools? The project is anticipated to have 3-4 elementary schools a middle school and perhaps a high school or funding toward a high school, which may not be on the site, but would provide capacity for example at Mt. Diablo for those students on the site. School planning is based on student generation numbers; there has been coordination with MDUSD which continues. High school could also have a work training component as the campus district planning evolves.

15. Is there a rule to build a certain amount of market rate housing before the affordable is built? Yes, term sheet says 200 units. The affordable housing would then be interspersed throughout the site with a commitment to long-term affordability and oversight.

16. Homeless housing – will it have safeguards, to accommodate families in need, as opposed to druggies, etc. The Homeless Accommodation is primarily required within the first phase and will be located on one site, managed with services, and may have a job training component, as the Food Bank will have a new warehouse facility on site.
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17. Are there other PBCs (Public Benefit Conveyances) on site? Yes, the First Responder Training Facility for the County on the north side of Highway 4 is a PBC, but is located outside of the Specific Plan area. The other PBC discussed is the Regional Park going to the East Bay Regional Park District.

18. Is there a local hire requirement and union labor requirements? Five Point has indicated they will enter into a project labor agreement for the horizontal infrastructure. Vertical construction has yet to be determined, and will include a number of developers.

19. Is there a town square or similar to Todos Santos on the project? Yes, there is near the TOD and also near the Town Center in District G. These are not intended to take away from Todos Santos but would supplement and coordinate activities.

20. Concerned based on some of the reading I have done on Lennar, with running up debt and then bankrupting cities, are there safeguards? The City has a term sheet as well as a reimbursement agreement that spells out the various requirements. Five Point only has rights currently to the first phase of the project. BART and Coast Guard will be developed separately.

21. Not much industrial land? Correct, there is some commercial flex in the northern portion of the project along Willow Pass Road, that could accommodate certain types of light industrial uses potentially.

22. What is happening south of Bailey Road? EBRPD will be managing as a conservation area.

23. What to you makes the project first class? The campus, the TSP, the Open Space Network availability and connections to other regional trails, the availability of affordable housing within proximity to so many amenities and transit, each has potential to make the project world class and together provides a huge regional opportunity.

24. What is happening with Go Mentum? Smart Cities components/state of the art infrastructure, solar, transportation smart elements, and autonomous testing and research at the site will provide the ability to grow the site as a hub for these types of technologies. The Specific Plan anticipates that Go Mentum can be accommodated in the commercial flex area, and there may be some testing in the early stages of the project in certain areas.

25. Don’t make the streets to narrow; allow trucks and busses to be able to turn. We are currently having that debate.

8 p.m. close

Neighborhood meeting – May 2; Approximately 22 Attendees
Monument Corridor at Cambridge Elementary School, on Lacey Lane; 7:30 pm

1. What is occurring after transfer of the property from Navy? Are we giving to Lennar? There will be a transaction, selling the property to the master developer (and future developers), based on the term sheet and Development and Disposition Agreement (DDA), currently under negotiation.

2. Willow Pass Road – Will it be closed down for construction? WPR would be built on a slightly different alignment and thus would not need to be closed down. Kinne bridge will be more at grade level, except near Mt. Diablo Creek, to allow pedestrians/bikes to travel under.
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3. What is considered affordable, what will it be? The City’s commitment is to provide 25% of the units at the base as affordable to low income households. Currently that income level for a household of 4 is approximately $89,000. The City will be working with affordable developers and plans to provide developable pads with utilities for the affordable sites, selecting affordable developers through a process that may include Request for Proposal or a Notice of Funding Availability; the plan is to include projects with a variety of housing for vets, seniors, families, but the focus will be on selecting a developer that will build, manage and maintain the projects for the long-term.

4. Is it 27,000 or 28,000 jobs, how was that calculated? The job numbers were derived by applying typical standards based on land use. How many jobs does the City have currently? We will look into it and find those numbers for you. Note: The number of employed workers in City is about 64,000, and our leading employers are John Muir Health, Wells Fargo, Fresenius, Bank of America and PG&E.

5. Contractors doing the environmental clean-up have had issues – will we have same issues. The CNWS site is one of the cleaner bases in the Bay Area because things were not built here. Tetra Tech has not done any of the radio activity testing on our base. That said, we are concerned as well, and staff is trying to schedule a June 12 date with Council to have a broad discussion with the Navy on this issue. Still trying to get confirmation as to presenters to see if they are available for that date.

6. Affordable Housing – will some be for ownership? Yes, a small portion for inclusionary housing, as part of subdivisions.

7. In this area of California, 70% of students who graduate continue on to college, so a four-year school would be welcomed.

8. EBRPD Park – How quickly will it open? South of Bailey Road will likely open first, with some small parking area and trail head; but most of that is conservation area; north of Bailey Rd. there will be a park and interpretive area. Transfer from Navy could occur within next 5-9 months (Sept/Oct).

9. Willow Pass Road how many lanes? WPR is planned as a four lane road and will be a different road than currently exists in that there will be 6-7 intersections with signals and/or stop signs that will serve to slow traffic, along with slower speed limits. It will be similar to WPR at downtown now, over time.

10. The traffic study that is being prepared, right now the traffic in evening near Sun Terrace with the cut through traffic from Hwy 242 to Highway 4, is already concerning, with the new project what transportation improvements will occur outside of the project to handle the increases? The Traffic study will be looking at intersections, Hwy 4, Hwy 242, 608/Hwy 4 interchange and determine impacts and pay fair share of improvements.

11. Is West Street going through Concord High? Yes, in about 20 years. No plans to widen West Street or Denkinger Rd.
Memorandum

12. On the BART property – How much input does the City have? City worked with BART during the preparation of plans, but Council has directed to look at a wider buffer and we are back to the drawing board to see how a wider buffer may impact development on the site overall, as there will be trade-offs with height and density. Currently there is legislation, AB 2923, that would remove city controls over what gets built on the BART site. Staff is currently tracking the bill.

13. Water – can we manage better on this project with the inclusion of grey water systems? Developer is evaluating sustainability elements for the project. Area Plan said there would be recycled water. As part of the plan, we are looking at smart cities/sustainable components to make it a world class future forward project.

8:50 p.m. close
Concord Reuse Project
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North Concord Buffer and
District A Green Space
Overview of Area Plan

2012

- Focus on Transit Oriented Development (TOD):
  - TOD Core referenced housing of up to 20 du/gross acre.
  - Mix of uses including multi-family residential, offices, retail and services were anticipated, as well as hotel, community facilities, and performing arts facility, as potential uses.
  - BART site was included in the TOD Core (55 acres).

- Area Plan included a green buffer of an unspecified (but narrower) width adjacent to existing residents in the area of the BART site.

- Buffer was intended to provide a transition to the existing, neighboring residential development and space for pedestrian/bicycle connections to the station.
### Area Plan

**Figure 3-5: North Concord TOD Core**

**Table 3-5: North Concord TOD Core Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Districts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Acres</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Homes</td>
<td>700 (not required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Commercial Floor Space (square feet)</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density and Intensity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units / Gross District Acre (min-max)</td>
<td>Housing optional up to a maximum of 20 du/gross district acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units / Net Residential Acre (min-max)</td>
<td>60 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Floor Area Ratio (FAR) / Commercial and Mixed-Use Parcel (min-max)</td>
<td>2.0 - 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mix of Uses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Mix</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaza and Pocket Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriate Uses</td>
<td>Dining and entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-unit housing, possibly including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special needs housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing arts facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural/civic facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Convenience Standard                         | 1/4 mile           |
|                                              | (shared vehicle facility 1/8 mile) |
| Maximum Block Perimeter                      | 1,600'             |
| Off-Street Parking Location                  | Underground or embedded parking structures |
TOD Design

• TOD neighborhoods offer the greatest opportunity within the site for transit oriented living and walkability.
  – A walking and biking trail to activate the buffer and provide connections to the remainder of the project are critical design components.
  – The need for sufficient density around the BART station to support the TOD uses is also a critical design component.
  – Balancing these competing needs is important to success of the project.
April 2 Study Session
Two green buffer concepts presented previously:

**Option A**
- 25 foot setback to buildings
- 3 and 4-story buildings
- 5 and 6 story beyond

**Option B**
- 45 foot setback to loop road
- 45 foot setback to building 3 and 4-story building
- 5 and 6 story beyond
June 6 Study Session
Three green buffer options explored for North Concord

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenway: Property line to curb of Roadway</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property line to face of 3.2 building</td>
<td>105 feet</td>
<td>130 feet</td>
<td>155 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property line to face of 5.2 building</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 building</td>
<td>6-7 story</td>
<td>7 story</td>
<td>7 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1/3.2 building</td>
<td>5-6/6 story</td>
<td>5-7/7 story</td>
<td>6-7/8 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 3.2 treatment</td>
<td>6 story units facing neighbors</td>
<td>7 story units facing neighbors</td>
<td>Parking structure visible – no residential liner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1/5.2 building</td>
<td>3 and 5 story</td>
<td>3 and 5 story</td>
<td>3 and 6-7 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Space (acres)</td>
<td>1.8 acres</td>
<td>2.6 acres</td>
<td>3.4 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional park acreage (Blocks 2.2, 4.2, 5.3)</td>
<td>1.7 acres</td>
<td>1.5 acres</td>
<td>1.3 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 6 Study Session

Option A – 50’ setback to curb
- 50’ setback to Bldg. 5.2
- 105’ setback to Bldg. 3.2/3.3
- Linear acreage: 1.8 ac.

BART program same in each option
- Design only conceptual to demonstrate fit
- BART plans to retain developer over next few months.
June 6 Study Session

Option B – 75’ setback to curb
• 75’ setback to Bldg. 5.2
• 130’ setback to Bldg. 3.2/3.3
• Linear acreage: 2.6 ac.
June 6 Study Session

Option C – 100’ setback to curb
- 100’ setback to Bldg. 5.2
- 155’ setback to Bldg. 3.2/3.3
- Linear acreage: 3.4 ac.
Summary –

**Option A** – 50 foot buffer
- Provides buffer with reasonable width for bike and pedestrian trail.
- Allows most flexibility in design of remaining parcel.
- Type V construction on Parcel 3.3, rather than Type III.

**Option B** – 75 foot buffer
- Provides buffer with greater width for bike and pedestrian trail.
- Allows some flexibility in design of remaining parcel.
- Allows all structured parking to be wrapped.

**Option C** – 100 foot buffer
- Provides buffer with greatest width for bike and pedestrian trail.
- Allows less flexibility in design of remaining parcel.
- Increases room for water quality facilities.
- Reduces size of Transit Plaza and flexibility of design
- Increases Parcel 3.3 to 7 stories
- Inability to wrap structured parking on all sides
Summary

1) Differences among options are primarily driven by the width of the open space buffer.

2) As the buffer becomes wider, the buildings become taller.

3) Additional green space, parks and plazas are provided throughout the remainder of the TOD district.

4) Open Space in project overall (786 acres) is greater than existing parkland within Concord presently (636 acres). This does not include the regional park (approx. 2,600 acres).
TOD Open Space

Legend
1. BART Station Entrance (existing)
2. Future Additional BART Station Entrance
3. Transit Plaza
4. Linear Park – 100’ wide
5. TOD Plaza
6. Retail Zone
7. Town Square
8. Civic Site
9. Central Park
10. Landscape Buffer
11. Hilltop Park
12. Neighborhood Park
13. Elementary School
14. Pocket Park ("in tract")
15. Campus Open Space ("in tract open space")
16. Private Open Space

Map of the TOD Open Space project with various facilities and spaces identified by numbers and descriptions in the legend.
Concord Reuse Project
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Land Use Plan/Program Updates
Overview of Land Use Plan/Program Updates
June 6, 2018

• Land Use Plan/Program Updates Necessitated by:
  – Market and Feasibility Studies.
  – Desire to provide a broad product mix over time that attracts buyers locally and regionally.
  – Provide support for affordable housing through proximity to transit and services.
  – Support for transit and multi-modal goals of the project.

• As a result, developer has made the modifications to the land use plan and program. Overall Unit count remains the same sitewide and for Phase One.
Land Use Plan Updates

• Land Use Designations Shifted
  – Commercial Office designation in TOD; changed to Mixed Use (MU-1) --
    - Commercial/office uses would still be allowed, more flexible.
    - Commercial square footage remains the same overall.
  – Addition of Low Density Residential acreage along Mt. Diablo Creek (Dist. J) to accommodate larger lot, single family product.
  – Increased Medium Density Residential and Mixed Use (MU-3) along southern edge of transit spine (Districts E, F, I and J) to support and promote transit ridership over time.
  – Shift in acreage from MU-2 to MU-3 and less low-density residential acres.

• Minor shifts made in size of each of the Districts.
Concord Reuse Project Specific Plan
the Community’s Vision

Nov. 7, 2017

June 6, 2018
Land Use Program Updates

• Land Use Program Adjusted
  – Multi-Family units increased from 26% to 42% of the total. This includes the incorporation of Coast Guard units. Single Family attached units were decreased from 40% to 31% on site.
  – Single family detached units decreased overall from 34% to 27% with 3,525 units, however, this number is similar to that anticipated in Area Plan.
  – Multi-Family adjustments made to improve affordable/market rate mix in mixed use districts.

• Adjustments made to promote a more diverse product mix, attractive to a wide variety of buyers and income levels.
Multi-family Housing

- Area Plan: assumed 25% multi-family
- Nov. 7 program: 26% multi-family
- Updated program: 42% multi-family (w/ Coast Guard)

Affordable Housing

25% affordable - 2012 commitment; geographically dispersed

- Majority of affordable housing is met through multi-family product based on the development and service program of most affordable developers.
- Not reasonable to assume all Multi-family would be affordable; thus additional Market Rate Multi-family units were added to the overall program.
- Multi-family located to be competitive for financing.
  - Proximate to transit, amenities and disbursed throughout project.
Dwelling Units and Affordability

Area Plan | 11/7/2017 | 4/19/2018 |
---|---|---|
12,200 Dwelling Units | 13,000 Dwelling Units | 13,000 Dwelling Units |
Does not include Coast Guard Property | Includes Coast Guard Property | Includes Coast Guard Property |
25% | 35% | 42% |
Multi-Family | Affordable Housing (25%) | Single-Family
Summary –

Staff supports adjustments to the plan/program to optimize land uses and bolster success for affordable housing.

Implementation details for inclusion within the Specific Plan will be important to ensure that:

- Early stages/phases do not develop housing units faster than overall development due to the broad density ranges provided and that sufficient capacity is available for later phases within the overall housing cap.
- Flexibility is allowed, but limited, to ensure a diverse housing mix across the project.
- Housing is coordinated with development of the transit spine and shuttle to ensure long-term viability of ridership.