ALAMEDA
LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

ALAMEDA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

REMEN TRACT STUDY

Municipal Service, Infrastructure and Annexation Feasibility Analysis

A planning-level evaluation of existing conditions, remaining utility and infrastructure needs, annexation considerations, financing options, and an implementation pathway for the Remen Tract unincorporated island.

REVISED DRAFT

October 2026

Prepared by Rachel Jones, Alameda LAFCO Executive Officer

Planning-Level Study

This report is intended to support interagency and community discussion. Cost estimates are feasibility-level assumptions and should be refined through parcel verification and engineering before implementation. Revised to address City of Pleasanton comments dated October 30, 2026.

CONTENTS

REPORT AT A GLANCE **4**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **5**

FIGURE 1. REMEN TRACT STUDY AREA **7**

1. BACKGROUND AND STUDY PURPOSE **9**

1.1 A Legacy Island Within Pleasanton 9
1.2 LAFCO Review of Out-of-Area Services 9
1.3 Continued LAFCO Interest 10
1.4 Purpose and Scope of This Study 10

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS AND SERVICE PATTERN **11**

2.1 Governance and Jurisdiction 11
2.2 Parcel and Utility Baseline 11
2.2A Documented City Utility Service by Parcel 12
2.3 Wastewater Service - More Complete Historical Record 13
2.4 Water Service and Private/Common Infrastructure 15
2.5 2024–2025 Water-Line Failure: Current Evidence of the Governance Problem 16

3. STREETS, DRAINAGE, FIRE ACCESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD FORM **18**

3.1 Existing Street Pattern 18
3.2 Street Improvement Scenarios 18

4. LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS **19**

5. ANNEXATION FEASIBILITY **20**

5.1 Boundary Logic 20
5.2 Administrative Annexation Cost 20
5.3 Island Annexation Procedure 20
5.4 Initiation, Required Approvals and Roles 21

6. INFRASTRUCTURE COST AND FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY **22**

6.1 Costing Principle: Pay Only for the Remaining Deficiency 22
6.2 Parcel-Specific Wastewater Costs 22
6.3 Water and Shared Private Infrastructure 23
6.4 Streets and Common Improvements 23
6.5 Planning-Level Program Range 23

7. FINANCING OPTIONS AND PAYMENT OVER TIME **25**

7.1 Cost Allocation Before Financing 25
7.2 Assessment District as the Principal Pay-Over-Time Tool 25
7.3 Illustrative Annual Payment 26
7.4 Other Financing Approaches 26

8. GOVERNANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION ALTERNATIVES 27

9. STUDY FINDINGS 28

10. RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM 30

11. CONCLUSION AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM 31

11.1 Community Engagement Should Precede Formal Annexation 31
11.2 First Community Meeting — Existing Conditions and Study Findings 32
11.3 Property-Owner and Utility-Connection Survey 32
11.4 Second Community Meeting — Costs, Financing, and Alternatives 33
11.5 Parcel-Level Utility Verification and Connection Program 33
11.6 Engineering Reconnaissance and Minimum Improvement Standard 34
11.7 Financing Feasibility 34
11.8 Decision Point Following Outreach and Cost Refinement 35
11.9 Recommended Implementation Schedule 35
11.10 Recommended Commission Direction 36

APPENDIX A - REMEN TRACT POLICY AND SERVICE TIMELINE 37

APPENDIX B - DATA REQUIRED FOR FINAL IMPLEMENTATION 38

APPENDIX C - PRINCIPAL SOURCES 39

APPENDIX D - RESPONSE TO CITY OF PLEASANTON COMMENTS 40

REPORT AT A GLANCE

PURPOSE

This study evaluates whether annexation of the Remen Tract to the City of Pleasanton can be advanced in a practical and financially manageable manner. It focuses on the remaining service and infrastructure gaps - not on rebuilding a largely developed neighborhood to a new-subdivision standard.

Study Question	Staff Assessment
Is annexation the logical long-term governance outcome?	Yes. Remen is a completely surrounded unincorporated island within Pleasanton and is already substantially dependent on City utility service.
Is the administrative cost of annexation the principal barrier?	No. LAFCO processing can be reduced or waived, and boundary-completion costs are minor relative to physical improvements.
Are most parcels already connected to municipal utilities?	Yes. The 2021 Alameda LAFCO utility MSR identifies 48 parcels, 38 with existing water and/or sewer connections. Those connections run through private water lines and sewer laterals inside the tract whose condition is not documented.
How extensive is the remaining sewer issue?	Smaller than earlier drafts suggested. LAVWMA documented 27 physical sewer connections in 2018, three additional properties with approved/stubbed rights, and 18 properties then lacking sewer connections; all 18 were described as relatively easy to connect to existing public mains. A City feasibility study would be needed to confirm the work required to connect the remaining homes to the City sewer system.
What is the principal cost uncertainty?	The condition and future treatment of private/common infrastructure - particularly private streets and shared water facilities - and what Pleasanton would require as a condition of annexation. The City has indicated it would prioritize bringing the area into compliance with City, State and Federal standards, with costs borne by property owners.
How could common improvements be paid over time?	A special-benefit assessment district with bond financing is a plausible option, subject to an engineer's report, Proposition 218 procedures, and property-owner approval.
Do residents support annexation?	Not historically. Prior efforts, most recently LAFCO's May 2017 community meeting, did not show majority support. Current owner views are unknown and would be tested through the outreach in Section 11.
Can annexation be initiated without a City resolution?	A petition of landowners or registered voters may initiate a proposal. However, the City must prezone the territory and agree with the County on a property tax exchange, and the streamlined island procedure requires a City resolution. City Council action is therefore required in practice (Section 5.4).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Remen Tract is a long-established residential enclave that remains under Alameda County jurisdiction even though it is completely surrounded by the City of Pleasanton and is already substantially connected to Pleasanton municipal infrastructure. The neighborhood developed under a semi-rural pattern: private streets, limited urban street improvements, onsite wastewater systems, and private or shared water facilities. Over time, however, individual properties were connected to City water and wastewater as development occurred or onsite systems failed. The result is not an unserved neighborhood waiting for urban infrastructure. It is a mostly served neighborhood with a small number of remaining service gaps and unresolved responsibility for certain private/common facilities.

That distinction is central to the feasibility analysis. The 2021 Alameda LAFCO Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review identifies 48 Remen parcels, of which 38 had existing water and/or sewer connections, and notes 24 properties with pre-annexation agreements. The City of Pleasanton Parcel Services List reviewed for this study identifies those 38 served properties individually: 27 are listed as receiving both City water and sewer and 11 are listed as receiving City water only. LAVWMA records provide the more detailed wastewater history, including 27 physical sewer connections in 2018, three additional approved/stubbed sewer rights, and later LAFCO wastewater approvals. The remaining utility issue is therefore a targeted parcel and infrastructure issue, not a neighborhood-wide utility-extension project.

The historical record also explains why the island persists. Remen residents have long valued the neighborhood's distinct character and private-street setting. At the same time, County development approvals increasingly relied on Pleasanton water and sewer, and the City used pre-annexation agreements in connection with some out-of-area service extensions. In July 2017, after LAFCO retroactively addressed prior service extensions, the Commission required Pleasanton and Alameda County to prepare a comprehensive study addressing existing services, infrastructure, changes that could accompany annexation, financial feasibility, financing options, and development standards. The present study is intended to carry that direction forward in a form that is useful for implementation.

That history includes consistent resident opposition. Previous efforts to explore annexation, most recently LAFCO’s May 2017 community meeting, did not demonstrate majority support. Residents raised concerns about infrastructure upgrade and maintenance costs, easements, traffic control, grandfathering of existing uses and City property taxes, and have not supported paying for studies of what it would take to bring the tract’s infrastructure to City standards. Any path forward depends on current owner views, which have not been measured since 2017.

The 2024-2025 failure of a private water line serving six Remen homes illustrates the practical consequence of leaving the service structure unresolved. Pleasanton temporarily supplied the affected homes through hydrant-fed hoses, but later discontinued the temporary arrangement because of water-quality and system-safety concerns. The City stated that the failed line was privately owned and could not be repaired with water enterprise funds. The incident did not create the Remen governance problem; it exposed it. Residents can be

City water customers while still depending on privately owned infrastructure for which public maintenance responsibility is disputed or unavailable.

For feasibility purposes, staff does not recommend carrying a large administrative annexation budget, a property-tax-exchange allowance, or separate legal, planning, and CEQA allowances as neighborhood capital costs. LAFCO processing costs for an island annexation may be reduced or waived by the Commission, and the remaining boundary-completion expenses are expected to be small compared with physical improvements. The principal fiscal questions are therefore: (1) which parcels still require water or sewer work; (2) what common water infrastructure must be repaired, replaced, or regularized; (3) what level of street, drainage, and emergency-access improvement Pleasanton would require; and (4) how common improvements could be financed over time without charging already-served parcels for another parcel's private connection.

The City of Pleasanton's review of the draft study identified issues that bear directly on feasibility. Infrastructure inside the tract was built over time with little master planning, and some of it without permits or County or City oversight. The water lines and sewer laterals inside the tract are private, and the City's responsibility ends at its mains. If annexation proceeds, the City would prioritize bringing the area into compliance with City, State and Federal standards, with costs borne by property owners, and regulatory requirements adopted since earlier efforts may require more extensive replacement than previously assumed. The City also notes that annexation would require substantial City time and resources that have not been allocated.

Two policy questions should be resolved early. The first is what zoning should apply and how much future subdivision should be allowed, since new lots would add demand to infrastructure of unknown condition and capacity (Section 4). The second is how the process would be initiated: a proposal may be initiated by City resolution or by petition of landowners or registered voters, but City Council action, including prezoning and a property tax exchange agreement, is required in either case, and the streamlined island procedure requires a City resolution (Section 5.4).

FEASIBILITY CONCLUSION

Annexation remains the logical long-term governance outcome, and it may be feasible if the implementation program is limited to verified deficiencies and common improvements can be phased or financed over time. Feasibility has not yet been demonstrated, however. It depends on (1) a condition assessment of the private water and sewer systems and a City determination of the improvements it would require, which current regulatory standards may make more extensive than earlier efforts assumed; (2) current property-owner support, which was absent in prior efforts; and (3) City Council direction and resources.

FIGURE 1. REMEN TRACT STUDY AREA



Figure 1. Remen Tract study area and principal streets.

The Remen Tract is an unincorporated Alameda County island completely surrounded by the City of Pleasanton. The map is included to orient the reader to the neighborhood and the principal internal streets discussed throughout this study. A formal annexation proposal would require an official map and legal description prepared and reviewed through the applicable boundary-change process.

1. BACKGROUND AND STUDY PURPOSE

1.1 A Legacy Island Within Pleasanton

Remen Tract is a small residential neighborhood located near Vineyard and Bernal avenues and completely surrounded by the City of Pleasanton. Its physical form predates much of the surrounding urban development. Historical reporting from 2001 described dirt or unimproved private streets, no sidewalks or streetlights, septic systems, and an older small-diameter water system. Property ownership extended to the centerline of private roadways, with neighborhood access rights rather than a conventional public-street system. That development pattern helped preserve a semi-rural character that residents historically valued and helps explain why annexation did not occur as Pleasanton grew around the tract.

The island condition became more complex as surrounding development urbanized and individual Remen properties sought municipal service. Alameda County, as the land-use authority, increasingly required or encouraged new development to obtain City water and wastewater service. Pleasanton extended those services to individual properties outside the City boundary, and some service extensions were accompanied by pre-annexation agreements. The result was incremental functional integration without a corresponding jurisdictional change: Remen remained unincorporated, but a growing share of its properties became City utility customers.

Source: Historical neighborhood conditions: Pleasanton Weekly, June 8, 2001. Current island/service context: Alameda LAFCO Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review, November 2021.

1.2 LAFCO Review of Out-of-Area Services

California law generally requires LAFCO approval before a city or district extends new or extended services outside its jurisdictional boundary. By the mid-2010s, Alameda LAFCO identified a number of Pleasanton service extensions in unincorporated areas that had not previously been submitted for LAFCO approval. Remen Tract was significant because the issue was not a single isolated connection; it involved an entire unincorporated island with a long history of piecemeal City service. LAFCO approval under Government Code section 56133 applies to services first provided after January 1, 2001. Working with LAFCO staff, the City requested retroactive approval and compiled a list of Remen properties whose connections occurred after that date. That list is narrower than the list of all existing connections discussed in Section 2, which also includes connections made before 2001.

LAFCO's 2016-2017 review therefore moved beyond retroactive approval of individual connections. The Commission recognized that continued case-by-case service extensions could perpetuate the island indefinitely. In July 2017, Alameda LAFCO required Pleasanton and Alameda County to complete a comprehensive Remen study addressing the current nature and extent of municipal services and infrastructure, changes in service or service levels that could be required upon annexation, financial feasibility and financing options. The Commission also required the agencies to identify guiding principles for development standards, planning, and zoning. LAFCO staff subsequently met with Pleasanton and County staff in September 2017 to discuss the RFP process and study requirements.

Source: Alameda LAFCO Application/Inquiry Update, 2018, describing the July 2017 conditions and September 2017 staff meeting.

1.3 Continued LAFCO Interest

The Remen study did not disappear from LAFCO's work program. Subsequent Alameda LAFCO work plans continued to identify an informational or feasibility report on Remen Tract, and the 2021 Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review expressly recommended continued coordination between Alameda LAFCO and Pleasanton on a feasibility study for wastewater services to the community. The present study responds to that continuing policy direction and updates the analysis in light of the neighborhood's current service history and recent water-system failure.

The comprehensive study required by the Commission in 2017 was not completed. According to the City, residents opposed annexation and did not support funding studies to determine what would be needed to bring infrastructure up to City standards, and City resources have not been allocated to the effort. This study does not replace the engineering and condition assessment the 2017 direction contemplated; it identifies the information that remains necessary and a sequence for obtaining it.

Source: Alameda LAFCO FY 2020-2021 Work Plan; Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review, November 2021.

1.4 Purpose and Scope of This Study

This is a special study of Remen Tract service and annexation conditions. It is not an annexation application, an engineer's report, or a final assessment proceeding. Its purpose is to determine whether there is a practical pathway to resolve the island and, if so, what information and financing structure would be needed before a formal annexation proposal is initiated.

The analysis is organized around six questions:

- What municipal services and infrastructure already exist, and which parcels remain outside City water or sewer service?
- What physical improvements are reasonably necessary to support annexation and to support current State and Federal regulatory requirements for water and sewer operations, as distinguished from improvements that could be triggered only by future development?
- What is the planning-level magnitude of the remaining costs, recognizing that most parcels already receive at least one City utility service?
- How could common improvements be financed over time, and how should parcel-specific costs be separated from neighborhood-wide costs?
- What zoning should apply, how much future subdivision should be allowed, and what additional demand could future development place on existing and future infrastructure?
- What sequence of agency actions would be needed to move from study to an implementable annexation proposal?

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS AND SERVICE PATTERN

2.1 Governance and Jurisdiction

Remen Tract remains unincorporated territory under Alameda County land-use jurisdiction. The area is within Pleasanton's sphere of influence and is completely surrounded by the City. Zone 7 Water Agency provides regional stormwater and flood-control functions. Pleasanton delivers water to the tract through connections at its mains in the public right-of-way, and many parcels discharge to City sewer mains. The water lines and sewer laterals inside the tract are private; the City does not maintain, inspect or regulate them. This overlap of County land-use authority, City utility service, regional flood-control responsibility, and private infrastructure is the central governance condition evaluated in this study.

Function	Existing Condition
Land use and development review	Alameda County
Water service	City water delivered through a private distribution system inside the tract; City responsibility ends at the main in the public right-of-way. City meters at each parcel are for billing only. Some connections may have been made without City knowledge or approval.
Wastewater	Private laterals inside the tract connect to City sewer mains; the City does not inspect or maintain facilities inside the tract. Remaining parcels include septic/unconnected properties.
Stormwater / regional flood control	Zone 7 Water Agency and other applicable public entities. Whether tract stormwater discharges to the City storm drain system has not been confirmed.
Local streets	Historically private within the tract, except surrounding public streets
Boundary / service coordination	Alameda LAFCO

2.2 Parcel and Utility Baseline

The 2021 Alameda LAFCO Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review identifies 48 Remen Tract parcels and reports that 38 had an existing City water and/or sewer connection. The City of Pleasanton Service Parcel List reviewed for this study identifies the same 38 served parcels individually: 27 are listed as receiving both City water and sewer and 11 are listed as receiving City water only. The remaining 10 parcels are not assigned an active water or sewer service category on the City list. Accordingly, the study can explicitly identify the properties already receiving municipal service rather than treating parcel-level service status as an unknown. Implementation-level confirmation is still appropriate to capture later sewer approvals, current account status, prior fees paid, and ownership of private/shared facilities. A parcel listed as receiving City service is served through private facilities inside the tract, and the listing does not indicate the condition or adequacy of those facilities. Until they are assessed, existing connections should be assumed to require some investment to meet City standards.

Source: Alameda LAFCO Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review, November 2021.

2.2A Documented City Utility Service by Parcel

APN	Property	City Service Listed
946-1710-002-02	3429 Bernal Avenue	Both
946-1710-003-00	3437 Bernal Avenue	Both
946-1710-004-00	3445 Bernal Avenue	Both
946-1708-007-00	3465 Bernal Avenue	Both
946-1708-008-00	3469 Bernal Avenue	Both
946-1708-009-01	3477 Bernal Avenue	Both
946-1708-010-01	3485 Bernal Avenue	Both
946-1704-001-01	327 Linden Way	Both
946-1706-006-00	332 Linden Way	Both
946-1706-005-01	348 Linden Way	Water only
946-1706-010-00	364 Linden Way	Water only
946-1706-009-00	368 Linden Way	Both
946-1704-015-00	373 Linden Way	Both
946-1704-014-00	385 Linden Way	Water only
946-1704-003-00	415 Linden Way	Both
946-1708-001-01	430 Linden Way	Both
946-1708-016-07	452 Linden Way	Water only
946-1708-006-00	3480 Vine Street	Both
946-1710-005-00	3527 Vine Street	Both
946-1710-006-01	3545 Vine Street	Both
946-1708-002-03	3548 Vine Street	Both
946-1708-004-00	3552 Vine Street	Both
946-1708-002-01	3568 Vine Street	Both
946-1704-008-08	3608 Vine Street	Water only
946-1704-008-07	3626 Vine Street	Both
946-1704-011-00	3631 Vine Street	Both
946-1704-008-06	3644 Vine Street	Water only
946-1708-011-00	3533 Vineyard	Water only

APN	Property	City Service Listed
946-1708-012-00	3545 Vineyard	Water only
946-1708-013-00	3557 Vineyard	Water only
946-1708-014-00	3573 Vineyard	Both
946-1708-015-01	3581 Vineyard	Water only
946-1704-006-00	3627 Vineyard	Both
946-1706-008-00	351 Virginia Way	Both
946-1710-008-00	354 Virginia Way	Water only
946-1710-007-00	366 Virginia Way	Both
946-1706-007-00	411 Virginia Way	Both
946-1706-002-07	425 Virginia Way	Both

Source: City of Pleasanton parcel/service list supplied to Alameda LAFCO. The list identifies 27 parcels as "Both" and 11 as "Water only," totaling 38 parcels with at least one City utility service. Later LAFCO wastewater approvals should be reflected in the current implementation ledger.

2.3 Wastewater Service - More Complete Historical Record

LAVWMA's November 2018 review provides a more detailed wastewater record than the aggregate LAFCO count. LAVWMA identified 30 Remen properties with rights to City sewer service. Of those, 27 had physical sewer connections and three additional properties had LAFCO approval and public sewer laterals stubbed to the property line but had not yet physically connected. LAVWMA separately identified 18 properties without sewer connections and concluded that all 18 could request connections that would be relatively easy to make to existing public sewer mains in the area. This finding materially affects the feasibility analysis: the remaining sewer issue was not characterized as requiring a new neighborhood collection system or major main extension.

Source: LAVWMA Board Agenda, November 21, 2018, Item 10, pp. 67-69 and property list at p. 100.

Table 2-3. LAVWMA 2018 Inventory of Remen Sewer Connections and Approvals

Property	Connection / Approval Date	2018 Status
3429 Bernal Avenue	11/1995	Connected
3437 Bernal Avenue	10/1997	Connected
3445 Bernal Avenue	07/1997	Connected
3465 Bernal Avenue	01/2006	Connected
3469 Bernal Avenue	10/2005	Connected
3477 Bernal Avenue	01/1993	Connected
3485 Bernal Avenue	01/2002	Connected

Property	Connection / Approval Date	2018 Status
327 Linden Way	01/1980	Connected
332 Linden Way	09/2012	Connected
368 Linden Way	01/2014	Connected
373 Linden Way	01/2013	Connected
415 Linden Way	06/2004	Connected
430 Linden Way	01/2006	Connected
APN 946-170401303, Vine Street	07/2017	Approved; no physical connection in 2018
3480 Vine Street	01/2009	Connected
3500 Vine Street	07/2017	Approved; no physical connection in 2018
3527 Vine Street	01/2007	Connected
3545 Vine Street	01/2002	Connected
3548 Vine Street	01/2006	Connected
3552 Vine Street	01/2006	Connected
APN 946-170800302, Vine Street	07/2017	Approved; no physical connection in 2018
3568 Vine Street	02/2009	Connected
3626 Vine Street	01/1973	Connected
3631 Vine Street	07/1993	Connected
3573 Vineyard Avenue	07/1993	Connected
3627 Vineyard Avenue	06/1998	Connected
351 Virginia Way	02/1998	Connected
366 Virginia Way	08/1976	Connected
411 Virginia Way	01/2011	Connected
425 Virginia Way	01/1998	Connected

Source: LAVWMA November 21, 2018 property list. The table is historical and should be updated against current Pleasanton records before implementation. APNs for these addresses are listed in Section 2.2A; the verified parcel ledger recommended in Section 11.5 should combine APN, address and service status in a single table.

The wastewater inventory has continued to evolve. In January 2020, Alameda LAFCO approved an out-of-area wastewater service agreement for 354 Virginia Way in response to a failing septic system and potential health and safety hazard. In January 2021, LAFCO similarly approved wastewater service to 3608 Vine Street,

conditioned on a pre-annexation agreement. These later actions demonstrate that the number of unconnected wastewater parcels has declined since LAVWMA's 2018 inventory.

Source: Alameda LAFCO January 16, 2020 agenda report for 354 Virginia Way; Alameda LAFCO January 14, 2021 agenda report for 3608 Vine Street.

Connection Count Summary

The available records support several different connection counts, and those counts should not be combined as though they measure the same condition. The 2021 Alameda LAFCO Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services MSR provides the broadest tract-wide measure: 38 of 48 parcels had an existing City water and/or sewer connection. LAVWMA provides the more precise wastewater count for 2018: 27 parcels were physically connected to City sewer, three additional undeveloped parcels had approved sewer rights with laterals stubbed to the property line, and 18 parcels did not have sewer connections. These figures establish that most of the tract was already municipally served, while also showing that the remaining wastewater need was concentrated in a minority of parcels.

Service Measure	Parcel Count	Share of 48	What the Count Means
A. Tract-wide utility connections, any service (2021 MSR)			
Existing water and/or sewer connection (2021 MSR)	38	79.2%	Parcels documented as having at least one City utility connection.
Not identified as having water or sewer connection in 2021 MSR	10	20.8%	Residual from the 48-parcel tract-wide count; current status must be verified.
B. Wastewater connections only (LAVWMA, 2018)			
Physically connected to City sewer (LAVWMA, 2018)	27	56.3%	Actual wastewater connections documented by LAVWMA.
Approved sewer rights / lateral stubbed, not connected (2018)	3	6.3%	Undeveloped parcels with approval and a public sewer lateral at the property line.
No sewer connection (LAVWMA, 2018)	18	37.5%	Properties LAVWMA identified as not connected; all were described as relatively easy to connect to existing public sewer mains.

***Source note:** Alameda LAFCO 2021 Utility MSR; LAVWMA November 21, 2018 agenda report and Resolution 18-03. Later service approvals should be reconciled through a current Pleasanton utility ledger before final implementation. Part A and Part B measure different things and should not be added together. Data on the condition of existing connections will require further assessment.*

2.4 Water Service and Private/Common Infrastructure

The City of Pleasanton Service Parcel List provides a parcel-level record of historical water service and identifies 38 Remen properties with at least one City utility service, including 27 listed as both water and sewer and 11

listed as water only. The principal remaining water issue is therefore not the absence of a parcel list. It is the ownership, condition, and configuration of the facilities between the City system and individual homes, including shared or privately owned lines. Pleasanton should confirm current billing, meter, GIS, and service-line information before construction or assessment proceedings. The City has clarified that all water lines inside the tract are private: the City's responsibility ends at the connection to its main in the public right-of-way, it installed meters at each parcel solely for billing, and it does not maintain, inspect or regulate the private system. The City also understands that some properties may have connected to the system without its knowledge or approval. Compliance with the City's cross-connection control requirements may require backflow prevention assemblies at individual parcels, which the owner would install, test and maintain.

That issue became acute in August 2024 when a private water line serving six homes failed. Pleasanton temporarily connected the affected homes to fire hydrants using above-ground hoses. In April 2025, the City removed the temporary connections, citing the risk that a damaged hose could compromise the broader potable-water system. The City also stated that the failed facilities were privately owned and that water enterprise revenues could not be used to repair private infrastructure. The episode is significant because it illustrates the difference between being a City water customer and having a fully public water distribution system. Any annexation implementation plan should resolve that distinction facility by facility.

Source: Pleasanton Weekly, May 6, 2025, reporting City statements regarding the August 2024 line failure and April 2025 removal of temporary connections.

IMPLEMENTATION **VERIFICATION**

The City parcel/service list establishes the historical service pattern and identifies the 38 properties already receiving water and/or sewer service. Before construction, assessment, or final annexation conditions are established, Pleasanton should confirm current account status, meter and lateral locations, prior connection/capacity fees paid, and ownership of shared/private water facilities. This updates the existing inventory rather than recreating the parcel-service list.

2.5 2024–2025 Water-Line Failure: Current Evidence of the Governance Problem

The most consequential recent event affecting the Remen Tract occurred after a private waterline broke on August 13, 2024. According to Pleasanton Weekly reporting published May 6, 2025, the failed line served six Remen homes. The City temporarily supplied those homes through fire hoses connected to City hydrants for several months, but removed the temporary connections on April 30, 2025 after determining that continued use created a potential risk to the broader municipal water system.

The incident is directly relevant to this study because it illustrates the practical consequence of Remen's fragmented service arrangement. Residents may receive and pay for City water service while portions of the distribution infrastructure serving their homes remain privately owned. The City stated that its water enterprise revenues could not be used to repair or upgrade privately owned infrastructure and that responsibility for the private line remained with the affected property owners. Residents quoted in the article disputed the allocation of responsibility and emphasized that they had long paid City water bills. The result was not simply an infrastructure failure; it was a service-responsibility dispute created by the tract's unusual combination of municipal service, private facilities, and unincorporated status.

WHY THIS MATTERS TO THE STUDY

The 2024–2025 failure demonstrates why the feasibility analysis should focus on ownership, condition, and long-term responsibility for shared/private water facilities—not simply whether a parcel is shown as "connected." A parcel can be connected to City water and still face significant risk if the infrastructure between the City system and the individual service points is privately owned, shared, or poorly documented. The implementation phase should therefore map the six affected homes, identify the failed line and its ownership, document the permanent repair or replacement status, and determine whether similar shared private lines exist elsewhere in Remen.

Featured source: *Pleasanton Weekly — "Residents in unincorporated neighborhood of Pleasanton left without water" (May 6, 2025)*

3. STREETS, DRAINAGE, FIRE ACCESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD FORM

3.1 Existing Street Pattern

Remen's private-street pattern is part of the neighborhood's historic form and one of the most important variables in the annexation analysis. Historical descriptions identify internal roads as private, without the continuous curb, gutter, sidewalk, streetlight, and public right-of-way improvements typical of newer Pleasanton subdivisions. The 2017 study direction contemplated review of paved streets, gutters, ADA-compliant sidewalks, utility upgrades, fire hydrants and equipment turnarounds, streetlights, and drainage or stream-setback conditions. Those items should be evaluated, but their identification as potential issues does not mean that every improvement must be constructed as a condition of annexation.

For feasibility purposes, staff recommends a distinction between (1) improvements necessary to address an existing health, safety, access, drainage, or service deficiency and (2) improvements that would ordinarily be required only when property is subdivided or redeveloped. Treating all modern subdivision standards as immediate annexation obligations would overstate the cost of resolving a long-standing island and could make annexation infeasible without a demonstrated service need.

3.2 Street Improvement Scenarios

Scenario	Scope	Feasibility Treatment
A. Maintain private-street configuration	Localized pavement repair; utility trench restoration; drainage corrections; emergency-access and signage work where needed.	Recommended base case. Most consistent with preserving existing neighborhood form and limiting annexation costs to verified deficiencies.
B. Targeted upgrade program	Broader pavement rehabilitation plus selected drainage, hydrant, turnaround, lighting, or pedestrian improvements where engineering identifies a need.	Reasonable upper planning case if Pleasanton requires defined upgrades before or after annexation.
C. Full urban street reconstruction	Public-street dedication/reconstruction with comprehensive curb, gutter, sidewalk, lighting, drainage and related work.	Not assumed. Should be evaluated only if Pleasanton identifies it as a mandatory annexation condition.

This scenario approach is important because street treatment could otherwise dominate the fiscal analysis. A feasibility study should not assign a multi-million-dollar urbanization cost without a City determination that such work is actually required. The next engineering step should therefore be a focused reconnaissance of pavement condition, drainage, access, hydrants, and right-of-way constraints, followed by a City statement identifying the minimum annexation standard.

4. LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Resident concern about annexation has historically involved more than utility cost. Remen developed under County rules and has retained a distinct lot and street pattern. Historical reporting described resident preference for the area's "rural" character and less urbanized development standards. The 2017 LAFCO study condition accordingly required Pleasanton and Alameda County to identify guiding principles for property development standards, planning, and zoning. This issue remains relevant because an annexation proposal that is perceived as a vehicle for immediate redevelopment standards could encounter resistance even if the service case for annexation is strong.

For study purposes, staff recommends that Pleasanton evaluate a pre-zoning approach that most closely reflects existing lawful residential development and minimizes the creation of unnecessary nonconformities. Existing homes, lots, setbacks, accessory structures, private-road conditions, and similar features should be distinguished from future subdivision or redevelopment. Future discretionary development can be required to comply with applicable City standards at the time of development without necessarily making those standards a prerequisite to the boundary change itself.

Future Subdivision and Zoning

Future subdivision is a threshold policy question rather than a detail of implementation. Additional lots would add demand to private water, sewer, street and drainage facilities whose capacity and condition are not documented. The City has asked what zoning should apply, whether and how much future subdivision should be allowed, and what risks and liabilities the City would assume if new lots were created on infrastructure that does not meet City standards, including streets and water facilities.

The parcels are currently subject to Alameda County zoning. Before annexation, Pleasanton would be required to prezone the territory (Gov. Code § 56375(a)(7)), and that prezoning would govern future subdivision potential. Staff recommends that the City's prezoning analysis evaluate (1) the zoning district or districts that best reflect existing development; (2) the maximum subdivision potential under each option; (3) the additional water, wastewater, street and drainage demand of that potential; and (4) whether further subdivision should be conditioned on improvements to City standards or limited until common infrastructure is upgraded. The answers affect both the infrastructure program and resident support, and should be shared with property owners early in the outreach process.

> **STUDY ASSUMPTION**
>
> No separate neighborhood capital allowance is assigned for legal, planning, tax-exchange, or CEQA work. Those matters may arise in the agency process, but they are not treated here as homeowner infrastructure obligations or as the principal measure of annexation feasibility.

5. ANNEXATION FEASIBILITY

5.1 Boundary Logic

From a LAFCO perspective, the boundary case for annexation is straightforward. Remen is an unincorporated island completely surrounded by Pleasanton, lies within the City's sphere of influence, and already receives substantial City utility service. Alameda LAFCO's 2017 cities MSR encouraged Pleasanton to annex appropriate islands and fringe areas, including areas already receiving service. The 2021 utility MSR continued to identify Remen as a location requiring LAFCO-City coordination. Annexation would align the governmental boundary with an existing service relationship that has developed incrementally over decades.

Source: Alameda LAFCO Cities MSR Update, December 2017; Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review, November 2021.

5.2 Administrative Annexation Cost

The administrative cost of processing the boundary change is not expected to be a material barrier. Alameda LAFCO may reduce or waive its processing costs for an island annexation on a case-by-case basis. Map, legal-description, County Surveyor, recording, and State processing charges may still apply, but these are boundary-completion expenses rather than neighborhood capital improvements. This study therefore excludes LAFCO processing fees and other minor administrative charges from the headline infrastructure estimate and does not treat them as a principal feasibility issue.

The study likewise does not use a property-tax exchange as a source of construction funding. Any tax-exchange action required for the jurisdictional change is an interagency fiscal matter and should be handled separately from the question of what physical improvements, if any, property owners would need to fund.

5.3 Island Annexation Procedure

Government Code section 56375.3 provides a streamlined process for qualifying unincorporated islands. Whether Remen satisfies every statutory condition should be confirmed as part of the formal annexation process, but its small size, developed residential character, complete surrounding by Pleasanton, and location within the City sphere make the statute directly relevant to implementation. If the statutory criteria are satisfied, the island procedure can substantially reduce the protest-related uncertainty that otherwise accompanies a boundary change. The streamlined procedure is available only if the annexation is proposed by resolution of the City and the Commission finds that the territory meets each statutory condition: it does not exceed 150 acres and constitutes the entire island; it is surrounded or substantially surrounded by the City; it is substantially developed or developing; it is not prime agricultural land; and it will benefit from, or is receiving benefits from, the City. When those conditions are met, the Commission must approve the annexation and protest proceedings are waived. This study does not recommend initiating an expedited annexation at this time; it recommends completing the verification and outreach phase in Section 11 first.

5.4 Initiation, Required Approvals and Roles

An annexation to a city may be initiated in either of two ways (Gov. Code § 56650): by resolution of application adopted by the legislative body of an affected agency, such as the City of Pleasanton or Alameda County, or by petition of landowners or registered voters within the territory. A petition for annexation to a city must be signed by at least 5 percent of the registered voters in the territory, or by at least 5 percent of the landowners who also own at least 5 percent of the assessed value of land in the territory (Gov. Code § 56767).

A landowner or voter petition can therefore start the process without a City resolution. Even so, **City Council action remains necessary in practice**: (1) the City must prezone the territory before the Commission can act on a city annexation (Gov. Code § 56375(a)(7)); (2) the City and County must agree on a property tax exchange before LAFCO can process the application (Rev. & Tax. Code § 99); and (3) the streamlined island procedure in Section 5.3 is available only when the City initiates by resolution. A petition-initiated annexation would proceed through standard protest proceedings: the proceedings terminate if 50 percent or more of the registered voters in the territory protest in writing, and an election is required if protests reach at least 25 percent of registered voters, or landowners owning at least 25 percent of assessed value, but fall below the termination threshold (Gov. Code §§ 57075, 57078).

LAFCO cannot itself initiate an annexation to a city. Its role is to provide information, facilitate coordination, review any proposal that is filed, and make the required determinations. Any City decision to initiate, prezone, or commit staff and resources would be made by the Pleasanton City Council in the context of its adopted priorities and the historical position of Remen residents.

Participant	Role
Remen property owners and registered voters	May initiate by petition; participate in outreach and the survey; may protest a petition-initiated annexation; would approve or reject any assessment through a Proposition 218 ballot.
Pleasanton City Council	May initiate by resolution (required for the streamlined island procedure); adopts prezoning; approves the property tax exchange; sets the infrastructure standards the City would require; authorizes City staff and resources.
Alameda County Board of Supervisors	Current land-use authority; may initiate by resolution; approves the property tax exchange. County Environmental Health oversees septic systems and wells.
Alameda LAFCO	Leads informational outreach if directed by the Commission; reviews any proposal and makes the required determinations; may reduce or waive its processing fees; conducts protest proceedings where required.
Zone 7 Water Agency and LAVWMA	Regional water supply and wastewater export; Zone 7 connection fees apply to new water connections.

Source: Government Code §§ 56375, 56375.3, 56650, 56767, 57075 and 57078; Revenue and Taxation Code § 99. Statutory summaries should be confirmed with LAFCO counsel.

6. INFRASTRUCTURE COST AND FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

6.1 Costing Principle: Pay Only for the Remaining Deficiency

A tract-wide utility conversion or full urban street reconstruction assumption would overstate the cost of annexation. Most parcels already receive City utility service, the public sewer network is present, and LAVWMA found the remaining sewer connections to be relatively easy. The appropriate cost model is incremental: identify each remaining deficiency, determine whether it is parcel-specific or common, and estimate only the work needed to resolve that deficiency. The financial evaluation should also account for long-term maintenance and replacement of the water, sewer and storm drain facilities serving the tract, whether those facilities become public or remain private, and even if streets remain privately owned. Capital cost alone does not measure the ongoing obligation.

6.2 Parcel-Specific Wastewater Costs

Pleasanton's own out-of-area service process provides the most relevant framework for remaining parcel costs. An existing residence requesting City water and/or sewer outside the City boundary must submit an Out-of-Area Service Agreement / Pre-Annexation Agreement application and accept financial responsibility for associated costs; City staff evaluates line availability and capacity before City Council consideration. As of 2026, the adopted City water connection fee is $5,269 for a single-family-equivalent 5/8-inch service, exclusive of meter installation and physical construction. The current single-family sewer connection fee is $556.24. Pleasanton is considering an increase to $2,250 effective January 1, 2027, subject to the November 17, 2026 public hearing. Physical laterals, trenching, septic abandonment, restoration, and any main extension remain site-specific. The fiscal model should therefore price only verified remaining work and should credit parcels for existing service and previously paid capacity. In addition to City fees, a separate Zone 7 Water Agency connection fee applies to new water connections and is substantial. It is collected by the City on Zone 7’s behalf and is not included in these figures or in the planning range in Section 6.5; current amounts should be confirmed against Zone 7’s rate schedule effective June 16, 2026.

For feasibility purposes, the parcel-utility allowance should be treated as a program reserve rather than as a multiplication of an assumed number of new connections. The City parcel list already identifies the 38 properties receiving at least one municipal utility service, while the LAVWMA record identifies the historical sewer gaps and later LAFCO actions document additional wastewater approvals. The remaining allowance should therefore be refined property by property after Pleasanton confirms which parcels still require a physical wastewater connection, whether an existing water-only parcel has since connected to sewer, whether prior capacity fees have been paid, and what private-side construction is actually required. The planning range does not assume that every parcel on a private well or septic system would be required to connect. Whether connection could be required, and under what authority, such as a County Environmental Health order for a failing system, a City ordinance applicable after annexation, or a condition of annexation, should be confirmed by the City and County, together with an approach for owners who do not wish to connect.

6.3 Water and Shared Private Infrastructure

Water costs should be separated into two categories: individual parcels that still lack an adequate City connection and shared/private facilities that convey City water within the tract. The current record is insufficient to assign a defensible parcel count for new water connections. The 2024 line failure, however, demonstrates that at least one shared/private facility requires a long-term solution. Accordingly, this study treats common water work as a targeted capital item to be defined through utility mapping and condition assessment, not as a tract-wide replacement of the City water system. The City has noted that regulatory requirements adopted since earlier pre-annexation efforts may require more extensive replacement of the private water and sewer systems than this allowance assumes, and that the existing system must be assessed, inventoried and evaluated both for current properties and for any additional properties. The allowance should be treated as a minimum until that assessment is complete.

6.4 Streets and Common Improvements

Street cost cannot be finalized until Pleasanton identifies the standard it would require. The base feasibility case assumes targeted pavement rehabilitation, restoration associated with utility work, localized drainage correction, and any demonstrated emergency-access or hydrant improvements. It does not assume comprehensive curb, gutter, sidewalk, streetlight, and public-street reconstruction. A focused engineering estimate should be prepared once the City confirms the minimum standard. The City has indicated that, if annexation proceeds, it would prioritize bringing the area into compliance with City, State and Federal standards, including water, sewer and stormwater system upgrades and replacement, dedication of street right-of-way, and installation of curb, gutter, sidewalk, paving, storm drainage and street lighting, with costs borne by property owners. That position corresponds to Scenario C in Section 3.2, which this study does not estimate. Until the City’s minimum standard is defined, the planning range in Section 6.5 should be read as a lower-bound scenario.

6.5 Planning-Level Program Range

Because current parcel water status and street quantities remain incomplete, the study should present a planning range rather than a false precision. The following range is intended to size the remaining program and identify which components require verification. It is not an assessment roll or an engineer's estimate.

Cost Component	Low Planning Case	Expected Planning Case	Upper Planning Case	Basis
Remaining parcel utility work	$170,000	$350,000	$640,000	Only verified remaining deficiencies. Current fee component: water $5,269/DUE for 5/8-inch equivalent; sewer $556.24 current, with $2,250 proposed for 2027. Physical connection work remains site-specific.
Targeted shared/private water work	$100,000	$250,000	$500,000	Allowance for identified common/private deficiencies; not tract-wide replacement
Street rehabilitation and utility restoration	$250,000	$500,000	$850,000	Base case assumes targeted rehabilitation, not full urban reconstruction
Drainage, fire access, hydrants, signage	$50,000	$100,000	$200,000	Only verified common deficiencies
Engineering / construction administration / contingency	$170,000	$250,000	$360,000	Planning allowance tied to physical work
TOTAL	**$740,000**	**$1,450,000**	**$2,550,000**	**Infrastructure/service-transition program; excludes LAFCO processing and separate agency process costs**

HOW TO READ THE ESTIMATE

The expected case of approximately $1.45 million is a feasibility placeholder, not a recommended assessment. If current records show fewer remaining utility deficiencies or if shared water repairs have already been completed, the estimate should fall. If Pleasanton requires substantially more street work, the estimate would rise. The report should be updated once the parcel ledger and minimum street standard are confirmed. The range also excludes Zone 7 connection fees, private backflow prevention, long-term maintenance and Scenario C street work.

7. FINANCING OPTIONS AND PAYMENT OVER TIME

7.1 Cost Allocation Before Financing

Financing should follow responsibility and benefit. A parcel that already has both water and sewer should not be assigned another parcel's private lateral or septic-abandonment cost. Conversely, a common street, drainage, or shared water improvement may provide a special benefit to multiple parcels and may be suitable for collective financing. The first implementation step is therefore to divide the capital program into parcel-specific and common-benefit components.

Cost Type	Potential Treatment
Private water/sewer lateral, meter, onsite trenching, septic/well abandonment	Direct property-owner responsibility or parcel-specific installment financing; only the benefiting parcel is charged.
Shared/private water main serving multiple properties	Allocate among benefiting parcels or include in an assessment district if legally supportable as a special benefit.
Private-street rehabilitation / drainage / access improvements	Potential special-benefit assessment if the engineer's report establishes proportional benefit.
General public benefit portion of improvements	Cannot be shifted to a special assessment; must be separately funded by the responsible public entity or another lawful source.
Future-development improvements	Defer to the property or development that triggers the improvement rather than impose as an immediate annexation cost.

7.2 Assessment District as the Principal Pay-Over-Time Tool

A special-benefit assessment district is a plausible mechanism for financing eligible common improvements over time. Under California's assessment framework, a local agency may form an assessment district, prepare an engineer's report identifying the special benefit to each parcel, conduct the Proposition 218 notice and ballot process, and, if approved, issue assessment bonds to fund construction. The resulting debt service is collected through annual assessments rather than requiring the entire capital cost at the time improvements are built.

The assessment mechanism is not automatic and should not be described as a guaranteed funding source. Proposition 218 requires the agency to separate general benefits from special benefits and prohibits an assessment from exceeding the proportional special benefit conferred on a parcel. Property owners receive notice of the proposed parcel charge and ballots weighted by the financial obligation. A majority protest defeats the assessment. These requirements are important for Remen because they create both a financing path and a fairness test: owners cannot simply be charged equally for improvements from which they receive materially different benefit.

Source: California Constitution, Article XIII D; California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission guidance on assessment districts and 1915 Act assessment bonds.

7.3 Illustrative Annual Payment

The table below illustrates the scale of annual payments if common improvements were financed over 20 years at an assumed 5 percent interest rate. It is not a proposed financing plan and excludes issuance costs, reserves, and differences in parcel benefit.

Common Capital Financed	Illustrative Annual Debt Service	Equal-Division Scale per 48 Parcels*
$600,000	$48,146	$1,003
$900,000	$72,218	$1,505
$1,200,000	$96,291	$2,006
$1,500,000	$120,364	$2,508

*Source: *Equal division is shown only to communicate scale. A lawful assessment must be apportioned according to proportional special benefit, not simply divided by 48.*

For example, financing $900,000 of eligible common improvements over 20 years at 5 percent produces annual debt service of approximately $72,000, or roughly $1,500 per parcel per year if divided evenly. The actual parcel amount could be higher or lower depending on the benefit methodology. A parcel requiring its own sewer connection would also have a separate parcel-specific obligation, while a parcel already fully connected would not be charged for that private connection work.

7.4 Other Financing Approaches

An assessment district is not the only possible mechanism. Depending on the final capital program and responsible agency, the implementation plan could also evaluate voluntary installment agreements, direct owner payment at the time of connection, coordinated construction with reimbursement agreements, grants or low-interest programs where eligibility exists, and phased improvements tied to system failure or future development. The preferred structure may ultimately combine more than one tool: an assessment for common improvements and separate parcel-level financing for private utility work.

8. GOVERNANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION ALTERNATIVES

Alternative	Advantages	Limitations	Staff Assessment
Annexation to Pleasanton	Aligns governance and City service; resolves island; provides a single long-term framework for infrastructure and future development.	Requires interagency coordination, parcel verification, financing strategy, and City agreement on infrastructure standards.	Preferred long-term outcome if remaining costs can be allocated and financed feasibly.
Time-limited out-of-area service approach	Can address an urgent failing septic or water condition before annexation.	Does not resolve the island; perpetuates piecemeal approvals and split responsibility.	Useful only as a bridge for health/safety needs.
Status quo	Avoids near-term boundary action.	Leaves private/common infrastructure responsibility unresolved and continues fragmented service governance.	Not a durable long-term solution.

The available record favors annexation as the long-term governance solution, but the study also indicates that annexation should be structured to avoid creating unnecessary infrastructure obligations. The implementation objective should be to correct the boundary and stabilize services while preserving the ability to phase noncritical improvements and assign future-development costs to the development that creates them.

9. STUDY FINDINGS

1. **Boundary condition.** Remen is a completely surrounded unincorporated island within Pleasanton and is already substantially integrated into the City's utility network. Annexation is consistent with LAFCO's long-standing interest in logical boundaries and efficient service delivery.
2. **Existing service investment.** The majority of the 48 parcels already have water and/or sewer service. Existing connections represent sunk infrastructure investment and should be credited rather than duplicated in an annexation cost model.
3. **Wastewater feasibility.** LAVWMA documented 27 physical sewer connections in 2018, three additional approved/stubbed properties, and 18 properties without sewer. It concluded all 18 could connect relatively easily to existing public mains. Later LAFCO approvals reduced the number further.
4. **Water infrastructure.** The 2024-2025 shared/private water-line failure demonstrates a real infrastructure and responsibility issue. The appropriate response is a targeted inventory and repair/regularization strategy, not an assumption that the entire tract needs a new water system.
5. **Street standard.** The largest cost uncertainty is the treatment of private streets and related drainage/access improvements. Full urban street reconstruction is not assumed in this study and should not be treated as an annexation requirement unless Pleasanton expressly determines it is necessary. The City has indicated it would prioritize full compliance with City, State and Federal standards at owners' cost, which would place costs above this study's planning range.
6. **Administrative cost.** LAFCO processing fees can be reduced or waived for an island annexation and are not a material component of feasibility. Minor boundary-completion costs should be handled separately from the infrastructure program.
7. **Financing.** A special-benefit assessment district with bond financing is a plausible method to spread eligible common improvement costs over time, subject to an engineer's report, Proposition 218 procedures, and property-owner approval.
8. **Parcel equity.** Parcel-specific utility work should be assigned only to the benefiting parcel. Common costs should be allocated according to benefit and legal responsibility; an equal division among 48 parcels is not recommended.
9. **Planning-level cost.** Based on the present record, a planning range of approximately $0.74 million to $2.55 million, with an expected case near $1.45 million, is reasonable for remaining infrastructure/service-transition work. The figure should be revised when current utility and street data are obtained.
10. **Overall feasibility.** Annexation appears feasible if the City accepts a targeted improvement approach, existing service investments are credited, common costs can be financed over time, and future-development improvements are not imposed as immediate neighborhood obligations. Current property-owner support and City Council direction, neither of which is established, are also prerequisites.

11. **Process.** Annexation may be initiated by City resolution or by petition of landowners or registered voters. In either case, City prezoning and a City–County property tax exchange agreement are required, and the streamlined island procedure requires a City resolution. LAFCO cannot initiate a city annexation.

10. RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

Staff recommends that the study move into a verification and implementation phase before any formal annexation proposal is filed. The objective of that phase is to replace the remaining planning assumptions with parcel-specific and engineering information sufficient for Pleasanton, Alameda County, LAFCO, and affected owners to understand the actual obligations.

1. **Current parcel utility ledger:** Obtain Pleasanton water and wastewater records for all 48 parcels, including meter/service status, sewer status, prior connection fees, approved-but-unconnected rights, shared/private lines, and pre-annexation agreements.
2. **Private/common infrastructure map:** Map shared water facilities, public and private sewer facilities, street ownership, pavement condition, drainage, hydrants, emergency access, and any known easements.
3. **Minimum City annexation standard:** Request a written Pleasanton determination identifying which improvements are required solely because of annexation, which can remain private, which may be phased, and which would be triggered only by future development.
4. **Focused engineering reconnaissance:** Prepare quantities and planning-level costs only for the improvements identified as necessary under the City's minimum annexation standard.
5. **Cost responsibility matrix:** Assign each cost to the benefiting parcel, a group of parcels, a public agency, or future development. Do not pool private connection costs into a neighborhood-wide charge.
6. **Assessment feasibility:** For common improvements, prepare a preliminary special-benefit methodology and financing model showing estimated annual parcel charges over a 15- or 20-year term. If supported by the responsible agency and owners, proceed to a formal engineer's report and Proposition 218 process.
7. **Resident outreach:** Present verified parcel conditions, expected individual obligations, common financing options, and the proposed land-use transition before initiating the boundary change.
8. **Annexation initiation:** Once the infrastructure and financing framework is sufficiently defined, confirm eligibility for the applicable island annexation procedure and proceed with the formal City/LAFCO process. Initiation may occur by City resolution or by landowner or voter petition (Section 5.4); in either case City prezoning and a City–County property tax exchange agreement are required.

RECOMMENDED DIRECTION

Use this study as the policy and fiscal framework for interagency discussions. Before annexation is initiated, return with a verified 48-parcel service matrix, Pleasanton's minimum infrastructure standard, a focused engineering estimate, and a financing/cost-allocation plan that shows the likely annual and one-time obligation for each parcel category.

11. CONCLUSION AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The Remen Tract presents a longstanding boundary and service-delivery issue rather than a conventional greenfield annexation. The neighborhood is already physically surrounded by Pleasanton, lies within the City's sphere of influence, and has received City water and/or wastewater service on a parcel-by-parcel basis for decades. At the same time, the tract retains private infrastructure, mixed utility conditions, County land-use jurisdiction, and a history of resident concern regarding annexation. These circumstances support continued evaluation of annexation, but they also counsel against moving directly from this study to a formal boundary-change application without a focused implementation and community-engagement phase.

The principal finding of this study is that annexation appears capable of being made financially and operationally feasible if the process is structured around the conditions that actually exist in Remen. The majority of parcels already receive at least one City utility service, and the study does not identify a basis for requiring wholesale replacement of functioning connections or complete reconstruction of the neighborhood to a new-subdivision standard. The remaining work should instead be directed toward verifying parcel-level service conditions, identifying the minimum common improvements necessary for a durable service arrangement, determining how those improvements would be financed, and establishing whether property owners would support proceeding once they have reliable information regarding costs and service options.

11.1 Community Engagement Should Precede Formal Annexation

Community engagement is particularly important in Remen because the historical record demonstrates that property-owner views have materially affected prior annexation discussions. In 2016, the Commission continued consideration of Remen service extensions pending a community meeting, and LAFCO staff, with City and County participation, subsequently convened a meeting with Remen property owners on May 31, 2017. The 2017 record reflects substantial opposition to annexation at that time, with approximately 40 property owners and other community members raising concerns about infrastructure upgrade and maintenance costs, easements, traffic control, and grandfathering of existing land uses, while also documenting support from some property owners, particularly owners concerned with development and access to municipal utilities. The passage of time, additional utility connections, changes in property ownership, and the more recent failure of private water infrastructure make it appropriate to obtain current community input rather than rely on positions expressed nearly a decade ago. According to the City, earlier annexation efforts likewise did not achieve majority support among residents, who preferred to remain in unincorporated Alameda County.

Staff therefore recommends a two-stage outreach process before preparation of a formal annexation application. The first stage should be informational and should occur before owners are asked to express a position. The second stage should consist of a parcel-owner survey designed to measure current service conditions, willingness to connect to municipal utilities where service is incomplete, interest in annexation, and tolerance for different financing structures.

11.2 First Community Meeting — Existing Conditions and Study Findings

The first community meeting should be jointly supported by Alameda LAFCO, the City of Pleasanton, and Alameda County. Its purpose should be to present information rather than advocate for a predetermined outcome. Staff should explain why the study was prepared, summarize the history of the island and prior out-of-area service approvals, present the verified utility information available for the tract, explain what annexation would and would not change, and identify the remaining questions that must be resolved before costs can be finalized. Staff recommends that LAFCO lead the informational meetings and the survey described below, with City and County staff participating to present service information and answer questions about their respective responsibilities. Participation by City and County staff would not commit either agency to a position on annexation or to funding.

The meeting should also distinguish among three issues that have historically been conflated: the governmental boundary change, connection of individual properties to water or wastewater service, and improvement of common neighborhood infrastructure. Separating these issues will allow property owners to understand that an already-connected parcel is not assumed to require a second utility connection and that the study does not recommend wholesale urbanization of Remen's private streets merely as a consequence of annexation.

11.3 Property-Owner and Utility-Connection Survey

Following the first community meeting, LAFCO should circulate a survey to every Remen Tract property owner. The survey should be parcel-based rather than limited to registered voters because many of the questions concern property infrastructure, existing utility accounts, future connection decisions, and potential assessments. Each survey should identify the parcel by APN and address so that responses can be reconciled with the utility and infrastructure inventory.

Survey Topic	Purpose
Current water service	Confirm City water, private/shared line, well, inactive service, or unknown condition.
Current wastewater service	Confirm City sewer, septic, approved/stubbed connection, or unknown condition.
Willingness to connect	Determine whether owners not fully connected would connect to City water, sewer, or both if service and financing were available.
Timing of connection	Identify immediate, 1–5 year, future-development-only, or no current interest.
Known infrastructure concerns	Identify private water-line failures, septic issues, drainage, pavement, access, hydrant, or other recurring problems.
Annexation position	Measure support, opposition, or undecided status after owners receive current study information.
Financing preference	Test interest in direct payment, installment financing, or an assessment mechanism for eligible common improvements.

Survey Topic	Purpose
Assessment tolerance	Obtain nonbinding feedback on illustrative annual cost ranges rather than asking only about a large one-time project cost.
Land-use concerns	Identify concerns regarding zoning, existing uses, setbacks, accessory structures, animals, redevelopment standards, or neighborhood character.
Participation	Identify owners willing to participate in a small stakeholder working group during the next phase.

The survey should be expressly described as informational and nonbinding. Its purpose is to establish the factual and financial assumptions for the next phase and to determine whether there is sufficient interest to continue. Survey results should be reported both by number of responding parcels and, where useful, by service category. For example, the report should distinguish the views of fully connected parcels from parcels that still rely on septic, private water, or incomplete municipal service.

11.4 Second Community Meeting — Costs, Financing, and Alternatives

After the survey and utility verification are complete, staff should conduct a second community meeting. At that meeting, owners should receive a revised parcel-service map, a summary of survey results, a refined estimate of common improvements, representative parcel-specific connection costs, and one or more financing scenarios. The objective should be to move the discussion from generalized concern about annexation to the practical questions that determine feasibility: what work is actually required, who benefits from each improvement, who would be responsible for paying for it, and what the annual rather than one-time financial obligation could be.

If an assessment mechanism remains a viable option, the second meeting should explain that a future assessment would require a separate engineer's report and the applicable Proposition 218 process. No assessment should be presented as predetermined. The community should instead be shown illustrative financing scenarios so owners can evaluate whether spreading eligible common capital costs over a longer period materially changes their view of feasibility.

11.5 Parcel-Level Utility Verification and Connection Program

In parallel with community outreach, Pleasanton should be asked to provide a current parcel-level utility ledger for all 48 properties. The ledger should identify active water accounts, active wastewater accounts, service laterals, meter status, prior capacity or connection charges where available, and any recorded pre-annexation agreements. County Environmental Health records should be used to identify active or historical septic systems and wells. The resulting matrix should classify each parcel as: both City services; water only; sewer only; neither; or unresolved. The ledger should be accompanied by a parcel map showing the distribution of each service category, which will help identify where upgrades are needed to meet current and future demand.

The survey question regarding willingness to connect should then be paired with this verified service matrix. This will allow staff to distinguish a parcel that physically lacks service from a parcel that has service available

but does not presently wish to connect. It will also permit preparation of a realistic connection program. If, for example, only a small number of parcels require sewer and those owners are willing to connect, the remaining utility program may be substantially less costly than a tract-wide allowance suggests.

11.6 Engineering Reconnaissance and Minimum Improvement Standard

The City should also identify the minimum physical improvements it would require in connection with annexation. This determination is critical to the feasibility analysis. The present study assumes that annexation would not, by itself, require full curb, gutter, sidewalk, streetlight, and roadway reconstruction throughout the tract. Pleasanton Public Works should confirm whether the private streets may remain private and identify only those pavement, drainage, water, fire-access, hydrant, or other improvements that are necessary to protect public health and safety or to support continued municipal service. The reconnaissance should not be limited to streets. The condition of the private water distribution lines and sewer laterals is equally critical, and the scope should include a condition assessment of those facilities (for example, video inspection of sewer laterals and evaluation of water-line material, age and pressure), together with an inventory of connections made without City approval and of potential cross-connections.

Once that standard is established, a limited engineering reconnaissance should prepare quantities and a planning-level engineer's estimate for the common work. This should be a focused scope, not a full design package. The objective is to replace broad allowances with a defensible estimate sufficient to evaluate financing and community feasibility.

Funding for the engineering reconnaissance and condition assessment has not been identified. The City has noted that this work could be costly and that City resources have not been allocated. Possible sources include the City, the County, participating property owners or grant programs. The agencies should agree on funding before the work is scoped.

11.7 Financing Feasibility

Following engineering refinement, staff should separate costs into common improvements and parcel-specific obligations. Common improvements that confer a measurable special benefit may be evaluated for assessment financing, subject to legal and engineering requirements. Parcel-specific laterals, onsite trenching, septic abandonment, or private service work should remain assigned to the benefiting parcel unless an agency elects to establish an assistance or installment program.

The financing analysis should present annualized owner costs over more than one term, such as 15 and 20 years, and should show how the obligation changes under different levels of public contribution or grant funding. This is important because the feasibility of Remen annexation is likely to depend less on the aggregate project cost than on whether individual owners can absorb the resulting annual obligation. It should address both capital costs and the long-term operation, maintenance and replacement costs of water, sewer and storm drain facilities.

11.8 Decision Point Following Outreach and Cost Refinement

At the conclusion of the outreach, survey, utility verification, engineering reconnaissance, and financing analysis, staff should return to the Commission with a supplemental implementation report. That report should not merely restate the present study. It should identify the verified number of parcels requiring each utility improvement, summarize current property-owner sentiment, provide a refined common-infrastructure estimate, identify a feasible financing approach, and recommend whether the agencies should proceed to formal annexation.

If the updated record demonstrates meaningful community support and a financially workable infrastructure program, LAFCO should work with Pleasanton and Alameda County to establish the appropriate initiation and processing path. If substantial opposition remains, the Commission would nevertheless have a current factual record from which to determine whether additional outreach, a phased service strategy, or another approach is warranted. In either case, completing this implementation phase would resolve the principal information gaps that have prevented the Remen Tract issue from advancing beyond periodic discussion.

11.9 Recommended Implementation Schedule

Phase	Recommended Action	Approximate Timing	Primary Participants
1	Agency coordination; confirm outreach materials and data requests	Month 1	LAFCO, Pleasanton, Alameda County
2	First community meeting: history, study findings, service conditions and process	Month 2	LAFCO lead; City/County participation
3	Parcel-owner survey and utility/service verification	Months 2–3	LAFCO, Pleasanton Utilities, County
4	Engineering reconnaissance and minimum-improvement confirmation	Months 3–5	Pleasanton Public Works / engineer
5	Preliminary assessment and financing analysis	Months 4–5	Finance/assessment engineer; LAFCO/City
6	Second community meeting: survey results, refined costs and financing	Month 6	LAFCO, City, County
7	Supplemental implementation report and Commission direction	Months 7–8	LAFCO staff / Commission
8	Formal annexation initiation, if directed and feasible	Following Commission/agency direction	City Council (resolution) or property owners/voters (petition); LAFCO; County

"Participation" in this schedule means providing records, technical staff support and attendance at community meetings. It does not commit the City or County to a position on annexation, to funding, or to City Council action, which would be considered separately.

11.10 Recommended Commission Direction

Based on the findings of this study, staff recommends that the Commission receive the report and direct staff to proceed with a structured Remen Tract implementation and community-engagement phase before initiation of a formal annexation proposal. The implementation phase should include: (1) coordination with Pleasanton and Alameda County; (2) at least two community meetings; (3) a parcel-owner survey addressing current utility conditions, willingness to connect, annexation interest, and financing preferences; (4) completion of a verified parcel-level water and wastewater matrix; (5) confirmation of the minimum City infrastructure standard associated with annexation; (6) a focused engineering estimate of common improvements; (7) evaluation of assessment or other pay-over-time financing for eligible improvements; and (8) return to the Commission with a supplemental implementation report and recommendation regarding formal annexation. Before significant City resources are requested, staff should confirm with the City whether the Pleasanton City Council wishes to participate in the implementation phase, and the agencies should agree on how the engineering and outreach work would be funded.

This approach would allow the Commission to advance the longstanding policy objective of resolving the Remen Tract island while responding directly to the principal concern reflected in the historical record: property owners need clear information regarding service, cost, land-use effects, and financing before they can meaningfully evaluate annexation. A deliberate outreach and verification phase provides that information without presupposing the outcome.

APPENDIX A - REMEN TRACT POLICY AND SERVICE TIMELINE

Period	Event / Significance
Pre-2001	Remen remains an unincorporated enclave as Pleasanton develops around it. Historical accounts describe private streets, septic systems, limited urban street improvements, and older/private water facilities.
2001	Historical reporting notes that new development is increasingly required to obtain City water and sewer and that Pleasanton seeks pre-annexation commitments with service.
2016	Alameda LAFCO addresses previously unapproved Pleasanton out-of-area service extensions and identifies Remen as a broader island/service-planning issue.
May 31, 2017	LAFCO convenes a community meeting with City and County participation; approximately 40 property owners and community members attend and raise concerns about infrastructure costs, easements, traffic control and grandfathering of existing uses.
July 2017	LAFCO requires Pleasanton and Alameda County to complete a comprehensive Remen study including municipal services, infrastructure, annexation-related service changes, financial feasibility, financing options, and development standards.
Sept. 2017	LAFCO staff meets with Pleasanton and County staff regarding RFP process and study requirements.
Nov. 2018	LAVWMA documents 27 physical Remen sewer connections, three additional approved/stubbed properties, and 18 unconnected properties that could connect relatively easily to existing mains.
Jan. 2020	LAFCO approves wastewater service to 354 Virginia Way in response to a failing septic system.
Dec. 2020 / Jan. 2021	LAFCO approves wastewater service to 3608 Vine Street, conditioned on a pre-annexation agreement.
Nov. 2021	Alameda LAFCO utility MSR identifies 48 parcels, 38 with water and/or sewer, 24 pre-annexation agreements, and recommends continued LAFCO/Pleasanton coordination on Remen wastewater feasibility.
Aug. 2024-Apr. 2025	A private water line serving six homes fails; Pleasanton provides temporary hydrant-fed hoses and later removes them because of system-safety concerns, emphasizing private ownership/responsibility for the failed line.
2026	Alameda LAFCO prepares updated Remen study focused on remaining infrastructure, annexation feasibility, and financing.
Oct. 2026	City of Pleasanton comments on the draft study, addressing infrastructure condition and standards, resident opposition, and process and roles.

APPENDIX B - DATA REQUIRED FOR FINAL IMPLEMENTATION

Data Item	Responsible / Best Source	Purpose
Confirm current APN/address and parcel-service inventory	City of Pleasanton / County Assessor / GIS	Update the existing 48-parcel inventory; do not recreate the parcel universe
Confirm current water account, meter, service-line ownership and prior fees	City of Pleasanton	Update documented water/both categories and identify private/shared infrastructure
Confirm current sewer connection, approved-right status and prior fees	City of Pleasanton / LAVWMA	Update LAVWMA inventory and later LAFCO approvals
Septic and well status	Alameda County Environmental Health	Identify remaining onsite systems and closure needs
Pre-annexation agreements	City / Recorder	Confirm existing commitments and affected parcels
Shared/private water facilities	City / owners / field survey	Define ownership, condition, and beneficiaries
Street ownership and easements	Title / County / City	Determine improvement authority and responsibility
Pavement, drainage, hydrant and access condition	Engineering reconnaissance	Define necessary common improvements
Minimum annexation improvement standard	City of Pleasanton	Separate annexation requirements from future-development standards
Assessment benefit methodology	Assessment engineer	Allocate eligible common costs under Proposition 218
Condition of private water lines and sewer laterals	Engineering condition assessment	Define replacement needs under current regulatory requirements
Zoning and future subdivision potential	City of Pleasanton (prezoning analysis)	Estimate future demand on infrastructure
Cross-connections and connections made without approval	City of Pleasanton / field survey	Identify backflow and compliance needs

APPENDIX C - PRINCIPAL SOURCES

- City of Pleasanton, Remen Tract parcel/service list supplied to Alameda LAFCO (27 parcels listed as both water and sewer; 11 listed as water only).
- City of Pleasanton, Out-of-Area Service Agreement / Pre-Annexation Agreement application and process — https://www.cityofpleasantonca.gov/assets/our-government/community-development/permits-forms-fees/out-of-area-service-agreement-pre-annexation-agreement.pdf
- City of Pleasanton, 2026 Master Fee Schedule / Water Connection Fees — https://cityofpleasantonca.gov/assets/our-government/finance-department/business-license/master-fee-schedule.pdf
- City of Pleasanton, 2026 Sewer Rate Update and connection-fee materials — https://www.cityofpleasantonca.gov/our-government/pleasanton-water/sewer-rates/
- Alameda LAFCO, Application/Inquiry Update describing July 2017 Remen study conditions and subsequent coordination.
- Alameda LAFCO, Countywide Water, Wastewater, Stormwater and Flood Control Services Municipal Service Review, November 2021.
- Alameda LAFCO, Cities Municipal Service Review Update, December 2017.
- LAVWMA Board of Directors, November 21, 2018 Agenda, Item 10, including Remen sewer property list and Resolution 18-03.
- Alameda LAFCO, January 16, 2020 Agenda Report, Out-of-Area Service Agreement for 354 Virginia Way.
- Alameda LAFCO, January 14, 2021 Agenda Report, Out-of-Area Service Agreement for 3608 Vine Street.
- Pleasanton Weekly, June 8, 2001, historical account of Remen Tract development and infrastructure.
- Pleasanton Weekly, May 6, 2025, report on the Remen private water-line failure and temporary water service.
- California Constitution, Article XIII D (Proposition 218), and California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission guidance on assessment districts and assessment bonds.
- City of Pleasanton, comment letter on the draft Remen Tract Study, October 30, 2026, with in-line comments on the draft.
- California Government Code §§ 56133, 56375, 56375.3, 56650, 56767, 57075 and 57078; Revenue and Taxation Code § 99.
- Zone 7 Water Agency, Water Connection Fee Information Sheet, effective June 16, 2026.

APPENDIX D - RESPONSE TO CITY OF PLEASANTON COMMENTS

The City of Pleasanton reviewed the October 2026 draft and provided a comment letter dated October 30, 2026, with in-line comments. The table below summarizes each comment and how this revised draft addresses it.

City comment	Response	Where addressed
Infrastructure was built with little master planning and some without permits; the system must be assessed, inventoried and evaluated for existing and additional properties.	Added to the Executive Summary and Section 6.3; condition assessment of water and sewer facilities added to the engineering scope.	Exec. Summary; 6.3; 11.6; App. B
The City would prioritize compliance with City, State and Federal standards, with costs borne by property owners; regulatory changes may require more extensive replacement.	City position stated; identified as corresponding to Scenario C (not estimated); planning range now described as a lower-bound scenario; Feasibility Conclusion revised.	Exec. Summary; 6.4; 6.5; Findings 5 and 10
Residents have historically opposed annexation; this should be stated up front, with the concerns raised in 2017.	Added to Report at a Glance and Executive Summary; 2017 meeting attendance and concerns added to Section 11.1 and Appendix A.	At a Glance; Exec. Summary; 11.1; App. A
Clarify whether LAFCO suggests an expedited annexation, whether Remen meets State-law parameters, and the roles of all parties; confirm the City Council must adopt a resolution.	New Section 5.4 explains both initiation paths (City resolution or landowner/voter petition), the prezoning and tax-exchange requirements, the conditions for the streamlined island procedure, and a roles table. The study does not recommend expedited annexation at this time.	5.3; 5.4; Finding 11
Water and sewer systems inside the tract are private; the City's responsibility is at the main; meters are for billing only; some connections may be unpermitted.	Corrected in Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4.	2.1; 2.2; 2.4
A feasibility study is needed to confirm the work to connect the 18 homes to City sewer.	Noted in Report at a Glance.	At a Glance
Distinguish the post-2001 connection list submitted for retroactive approval from the list of all existing connections.	Clarification added.	1.2
State whether the 2017 study proceeded and what halted it.	Paragraph added.	1.3
Address future subdivision, zoning and the City's risks if substandard infrastructure serves new lots; emphasize earlier.	New subsection in Section 4; new study question in Section 1.4; noted in Executive Summary.	Exec. Summary; 1.4; 4
Confirm whether stormwater flows to the City storm drain system.	Noted as unconfirmed in Section 2.1.	2.1

Add a title and APNs to the LAVWMA table; reorganize the connection-count table; add a parcel map.	Table title added; APN cross-reference added; count table split into Parts A and B; parcel service map added to the verification program.	2.3; 11.5
Add Zone 7 connection fees, cross-connection (backflow) requirements, and whether well/septic parcels must connect.	Added to Sections 2.4, 6.2 and 6.5.	2.4; 6.2; 6.5
Address long-term maintenance costs, not only capital costs.	Added to Sections 6.1 and 11.7.	6.1; 11.7
Who would pay for further study? Which agency leads outreach? What does “participation” mean?	Funding question added to Section 11.6; LAFCO proposed to lead outreach (11.2); participation defined after the schedule (11.9).	11.2; 11.6; 11.9; 11.10