San Bruno City Council Meeting
On the Bayhill EIR Preferred Alternative
December 4, 2018

Presenters

• Project Management (Management Partners)
  — Elaine Costello
  — Dan Marks

• Lead Planning Consultants (Dyett and Bhatia)
  — Rajeev Bhatia
  — Julia Malmo-Laycock

Agenda

1. Background and Overview
2. Summary of October 30 PC/CC Joint Session
3. Draft EIR Preferred Alternative
4. Council Questions on the Presentation
5. Public Comment
6. Council Direction on EIR Preferred Alternative to be Studied

Planning Area

Accomplishments to Date & Next Tasks
San Bruno City Council
Special Meeting
December 4, 2018

Meeting Objectives

• Review results of October 30 PC/CC Joint Session
  – Confirm items of apparent agreement
  – Discuss items that require decisions
• Discussion of the Draft EIR Preferred Alternative
• Provide direction on the EIR Preferred Alternative to be analyzed

What is an EIR Preferred Alternative?

• Alternative that will serve as the basis for environmental review
• Can reflect a bigger “development envelope” than the City may ultimately choose to adopt for the Specific Plan
• Approach that provides greatest latitude for the City Council when deciding on the Specific Plan
  – EIR provides information on impacts and mitigations that can guide decision-making

2. Summary of October 30 PC/CC Joint Session

Topics of Apparent Agreement

1. Cherry Avenue remains open to vehicles
2. Bayhill Shopping Center maintained as retail, with the incorporation of a housing overlay
3. Retain uses and permitted building heights (70 FT/5 stories) in the Transit Corridors Plan area as currently allowed

Topics of Apparent Agreement (2)

4. Allow for new/expanded hotel uses on all properties east of Elm Avenue
5. Permit housing with an overlay at the following locations:
  – Along San Bruno Avenue between Traeger and Elm
  – On the 801-851 Traeger site
  – The Bayhill Shopping Center site
6. Study the max. amount of office: 2.3 million sq. ft. (Alt. 4) plus 125,000 sq. ft. additional office at 801-851 Traeger

Topics of Apparent Agreement (3)

7. Move forward with the linear park/open space elements, rather than a centralized park
   – Design TBD in the Specific Plan
8. Incorporate community benefits (such as possible contributions to improvements at Commodore Park and to a new library)
   – Community benefits will be brought back outside the EIR
9. Facilitate multi-modal mobility through a variety of measures (bike lanes, pathways, lighting, etc.)
   – Design and location TBD in the Specific Plan
Topics Requiring Further Discussion

1. Grundy Lane. Include straightening as part of EIR Preferred Alternative?

2. Civic Use. Include the incorporation of a civic use within Bayhill as part of the EIR Preferred Alternative as an option for future consideration?

3. Building Heights and Stories. Should the EIR study:
   a) Increasing residential heights and stories (70 FT/5 stories) in the overlay areas?
   b) Increasing building height and stories for office (70 FT/5 stories without increasing total amount of new square feet)?
   c) Increasing building heights and stories (70 FT/5 stories) east of Elm Avenue for hotels?
   Any increase in height or stories would be subject to voter approval.

4. Housing Overlay on 801-851 Traeger. Include the entire 801-851 Traeger Avenue site in the housing overlay?

Development of the Draft EIR Alternative

- Based on the areas of apparent agreement, the planning team developed the following draft land use map illustrating a possible EIR Preferred Alternative.
- The draft map will be modified based on Council direction tonight.

Draft EIR Preferred Alternative Land Use Plan

- Uses and heights as permitted under the TCP.
- Max. office development as shown in Alt. 4, plus additional office on the 801-851 Traeger parking lot = 2,426,000 new sq. ft.
- Housing Overlays:
  - Along San Bruno Avenue West from Elm Avenue to Traeger Avenue.
  - On the whole 801-851 Traeger site.
  - On the Bayhill Shopping Center site, above retail.

Draft EIR Preferred Alternative Land Use Plan (2)

- 2.1-acre civic use fronting San Bruno Avenue W. between Elm Avenue and Traeger Avenue
  - Assumed to be a library for EIR impact assessment purposes.
  - Assumed as a permitted use on a site that would have an underlying use as office as well as a residential overlay.
- Hotel Use between El Camino and Elm Permitted.
Scenarios for EIR Preferred Alternative Estimated Buildout

Buildout numbers estimated for 3 different scenarios under the EIR Preferred Alt. based on PC/CC input:

1. Base Land Use Scenario
   - Max. office Alt 4 plus 125,000 sq. ft. on 801-851 Traeger= 2,426,000 sq.ft.
   - No additional housing outside of TCP
   - No hotel sq. ft.
   - No civic use

2. Base Land Use Scenario with Housing Overlay
   - Max. office Alt 4 plus 125,000 sq. ft. on 801-851 Traeger=2,426,000 sq.ft.
   - Housing overlays: 1,032 potential housing units
   - No hotel sq. ft.
   - 2.1 acre civic use

3. Base Land Use Scenario with Housing Overlay and Height Increases
   - Max. office Alt 4 plus 125,000 sq. ft. on 801-851 Traeger=2,426,000 sq.ft.
   - Housing overlays & height increases (5 stories; 70 FT): 1,530 potential housing units
   - Hotel height increase: 158,000 additional sq. ft. of hotel on Marriott & YT-owned site
   - 2.1 acre civic use

---

EIR Preferred Alternative Estimated Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Increase in Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt 4</td>
<td>EIR Base LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,594,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Use (AC)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Next Steps

- Draft EIR Preferred Alternative modified to reflect Council direction
- Start EIR analysis
- Concurrent work on Specific Plan
  - Planning Commission/City Council will provide further input/direction on key topics prior to finalization (Spring 2019)
- Public Review Draft Specific Plan and EIR release
  - Anticipated for late Spring/Summer 2019
- City Council action on EIR/ Specific Plan
  - Fall 2019

4. Council Questions on the Presentation
5. Public Comment
6. Discussion and direction on EIR Preferred Alternative

Thank you!
Planning Area

Alternative 1: Central Spine

Alternative 2: Bayhill Square

Alternative 3: Cherry Plaza

Alternative 4: Greenway Connection (Based on YouTube Proposal)

Buildout Summary: Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Alt 1</th>
<th>Alt 2</th>
<th>Alt 3</th>
<th>Alt 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Development (sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,594,000</td>
<td>1,086,000</td>
<td>2,160,000</td>
<td>1,472,000</td>
<td>2,301,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space (acres)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Use (acres)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Buildout Summary: Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Alt 1</th>
<th>Alt 2</th>
<th>Alt 3</th>
<th>Alt 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>1,694,000</td>
<td>1,086,000</td>
<td>2,079,000</td>
<td>2,120,000</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Plaza (AC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Use (AC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Impacts

#### OVER 15-20 YRS
- **Alt 1**: 4,900
- **Alt 2**: 9,700
- **Alt 3**: 6,600
- **Alt 4**: 10,300

- **Direct Housing Demand**
  - **Alt 1**: 3,300
  - **Alt 2**: 6,600
  - **Alt 3**: 4,500
  - **Alt 4**: 7,000

- **New Residential Units in Planning Area**
  - **Alt 1**: 730
  - **Alt 2**: 570
  - **Alt 3**: 980
  - **Alt 4**: 570

Total existing housing units in San Bruno in 2018 = 16,062

### Buildout Summary: Transportation Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Alt 1</th>
<th>Alt 2</th>
<th>Alt 3</th>
<th>Alt 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour Trip Generation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>4,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour Trip Generation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td>4,493</td>
<td>4,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections operating below City/Caltrans LOS standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation Impacts

#### Alt 1
- **New Jobs**: Over 15 years
- **Direct Housing Demand**: 3,300
- **New Residential Units in Planning Area**: 730

#### Alt 2
- **New Jobs**: Over 15 years
- **Direct Housing Demand**: 6,600
- **New Residential Units in Planning Area**: 570

#### Alt 3
- **New Jobs**: Over 15 years
- **Direct Housing Demand**: 4,500
- **New Residential Units in Planning Area**: 980

#### Alt 4
- **New Jobs**: Over 15 years
- **Direct Housing Demand**: 7,000
- **New Residential Units in Planning Area**: 570

### Fiscal Impacts (City’s General Fund)

- **All Alternatives are estimated to have a positive net fiscal impact on the General Fund**
  - **Alt 1, 2, and 4** are marginally positive
  - **Alt 3** is more positive due to new hotel

- **New commercial development is the most important variable**
  - **Alt 3** has highest fiscal performance
  - **Alt 1** has lowest fiscal performance

- **Most significant General Fund impacts:**
  - **Revenue**: Increased property assessed values generated by redevelopment
  - **Cost**: Need for increased public safety