

ALAMEDA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' TRANSPORTATION/ PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday, August 10, 2023
1:30 p.m.

Supervisor David Haubert, Chair
Supervisor Nate Miley

Location: Board of Supervisors Chamber – 5th Floor
County Administration Building
1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612

Summary/Action Minutes

I. **ACTION ITEM**: **United States Postal Service Mailing Place Names and ZIP Codes in Unincorporated Alameda County** (continued from July 3, 2023)
[Attachment](#)

Ali Abbors, Alameda County Planning Department, Community Development Agency, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the United States Postal Services (USPS) Mailing Place Names and ZIP Codes in Unincorporated Alameda County.

The USPS Mailing Place Names and Zip Codes project involves a potential change in place names and Zip code boundaries. The estimated cost for the project is around \$140,000, covering expenses such as mailing mandatory surveys and hiring outreach workers to ensure participation. The United States Postal Service (USPS) will review and implement any approved changes.

Community input was gathered through an online survey and outreach efforts in English, Spanish, and Chinese. The survey results showed that 66% of respondents preferred option one (place name change), 22% favored option three (Zip code boundary realignment), and 12% chose option two (alternate preferred last line change).

Based on the survey and community feedback, the recommendation is to pursue Option 1: *Place Name Change* Estimated cost without staff time: \$40,000 The unincorporated community Planning Area names would become the default USPS Place Names for each community. “Hayward” and “San Leandro” – city names – would no longer be default USPS Place Names in unincorporated Alameda County. ZIP codes would not change. Implementation timeline: 6 months from County request, in the short term and consider option three after assessing the implementation of option one.

Speakers

Keith Barros, Matt Turner and Christine commented on the USPS Mailing Place Names and Zip Codes.

Purpose:

- Report progress
- Advocacy or Education
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation**
- Other:

Recommendation from Transportation & Planning Committee: Support Option 1: Place Name Change, the unincorporated community Planning Area names would become the default USPS Place Names for each community. “Hayward” and “San Leandro” – city names – would no longer be default USPS Place Names in unincorporated Alameda County. ZIP codes would not change. Move to the full Board of Supervisors.

II. ACTION ITEM: Receive the Final Development Review Process and Proposed Work Plan Completed by Baker Tilly (formerly known as Management Partners) and Provide Direction on the Critical Path Items Listed in the Development Review Report and Presentation

[Attachment](#)
[Attachment](#)

Joni Pattillo, Special Assistant to the County Administrator, County Administrator's Office, Jan Perkins, Managing Director, Baker Tilly, Lynn Dantzker, Director, Baker Tilly, Dan Marks, Special Advisor, Baker Tilly, Elaine Costello, Special Advisor, Baker Tilly, Joan Schoening, Special Advisor, Baker Tilly, and Ashley Garcia, Senior Manager, Baker Tilly presented a PowerPoint presentation and a Development Review Report on the Proposed Work Plan for Alameda County Departments.

Baker Tilly has developed a Development Services Near-Term Work Plan to provide leaders in the County of Alameda with a guide for the next 18 to 24 months. The plan accompanies a report on opportunities for optimizing the development process but is not intended as a work plan to implement all 51 recommendations in the Development Services Process Review report.

The report highlights the importance of streamlining the development services process, empowering staff, improving interdepartmental coordination, and providing clear information to customers. Baker Tilly conducted interviews, reviewed documents, mapped the development review process, and evaluated business systems and technology.

Elaine Costello discussed the impact of state law requirements on residential development review processes. The state has been active in promoting residential development, and there have been changes in the development review process, emphasizing front-loading of information. All materials for planning applications must be on the initial application, and there are strict limitations on asking for additional information. Residential building permits must provide detailed checklists, and there are strict timelines for ministerial permits.

Additionally, the Municipal Advisory Councils play a role in discussing projects, but they need to understand the new timelines for residential projects. They want more training and the ability to initiate zoning and policy changes. Implementing a new permitting system is challenging, and having a cross-department working group is essential to ensure a user-friendly interface.

The public should easily find information about the development process on the county's website. Predictability is crucial, and estimated timelines should be published on the website for different types of permits. Staff turnaround times are important, especially for complex projects. Having a tracking mechanism for turnaround times can help identify and address issues in a timely manner.

The presentation also emphasized the need for additional financial and staffing resources to implement these improvements effectively.

Speakers

Michelle, Karl Wentz, Marc Crawford, Matt Turner and Kelly Abreu commented on the Final Development Review Process and Proposed Work Plan Completed by Baker Tilly.

Purpose:

- Report progress
- Advocacy or Education
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation**
- Other:

Recommendation from Transportation & Planning Committee: Support accepting the Baker Tilly Development Review Report and presenting the findings to the full board during a work study session.

III. INFORMATIONAL ITEM: Proposed Amendments to East County Area Plan and County General Ordinance Code Title 17 to Promote Development of Visitor-serving Uses Supporting the South Livermore Valley Wine Region

[Attachment](#)
[Attachment](#)
[Attachment](#)

Liz McElligott, Assistant Agency Director, Alameda County Planning Department, Community Development Agency, presented Proposed Amendments to East County Area Plan and County General Ordinance Code Title 17 to Promote Development of Visitor-serving Uses Supporting the South Livermore Valley Wine Region.

The proposed amendments to the East County area plan and County General Ordinance Code Title 17 aim to promote the development of visitor-serving uses that support the South Livermore Valley Wine region.

The proposed changes include correcting a clerical error, allowing sewer connections, and adding clustering provisions. These changes are being examined under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), but some may not require extensive analysis.

Next Steps

Staff to determine the appropriate level of CEQA review. The timeline for the project will depend on the complexity of the CEQA document required. After the CEQA document is completed, staff will bring the amendments to the Agricultural Advisory Commission for their input, to the Planning Commission to request a recommendation for approval by the Board of Supervisors, and to your Committee before requesting a recommendation approval by the Board.

Speakers

Lori Souza, Karl Wentz, Dick Schneider, Kelly Abreu, Diana Roberts and David Kent commented on the Proposed Amendments to East County Area Plan and County General Ordinance Code Title 17 to Promote Development of Visitor-serving Uses Supporting the South Livermore Valley Wine Region.

Purpose:

- Report progress
- Advocacy or Education**
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation
- Other:

This item was informational only and required no Committee action.

IV. INFORMATIONAL ITEM: Public Works Agency Permit Flow Chart

Daniel Woldesenbet, Director, Public Works Agency, presented the Public Works Agency Permit Flow Chart.

Director Woldesenbet discussed the referral process for building permits, particularly in relation to septic systems and environmental health. He clarified that rooftop solar projects are not referred to environmental health unless they involve ground disturbances near septic systems.

He highlighted the need for efficiency and a streamlined process in handling permits.

Speakers

Steve Ziganti and Kelly Abreu commented on the Public Works Agency Permit Flow Chart.

Purpose:

- Report progress
- Advocacy or Education**
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation
- Other:

This item was informational only and required no Committee action.

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEM: Cottage Food Operations and Microenterprise Home Kitchen Operations

Ronald Browder, Environmental Health Department, Health Care Services Agency, reported on the Cottage Food Operations and Microenterprise Home Kitchen Operations.

Some community members expressed concerns about permitting LLCs for these operations. The Committee discussed whether the law allows permits for individuals only and if there's room to interpret it differently. Director Browder explained their approach was to follow the law as written and maintain consistency with other counties in California. The Committee considered the possibility of changing the policy but noted it must be consistent with the law. The issue will be further discussed in a future report from the director.

Purpose:

- Report progress**
- Advocacy or Education**
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation
- Other:

This item was informational only and required no Committee action.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.