



# City of Woodland

## Meeting Minutes - Draft

### Planning Commission

City of Woodland Planning  
Commission  
c/o Community  
Development Department  
300 First Street  
Woodland, CA 95695  
530-661-5820

---

Thursday, July 23, 2015

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

---

### Special General Plan Meeting

#### A. Call to Order

*Meeting was called to order at 6:35 pm*

*Staff Present:*

*Ken Hiatt, Director*

*Cindy Norris, Principal Planner*

*Heidi Tschudin & Sophie Martin, General Plan Team Consultants*

#### B. Roll Call

*Present 7:*

*Chairman Kirby Wells, Vice Chairman Chris Holt, Commissioner Steve Harris,  
Commissioner Marco Lizarraga, Commissioner Fred Lopez, Commissioner John  
Murphy and Commissioner Elodia Ortega-Lampkin*

#### C. Approval of Minutes

*No minutes presented.*

#### D. Communications - Directors Report

#### E. Communications - Public Comment

*None provided*

#### F. Communications - Commission Statements Requests

*None provided*

#### G. Communications - Subcommittee Reports

*None provided*

#### H. Public Hearing

[16-029](#)

SUBJECT: Continuation of the General Plan Update 2035 -  
Overview and Presentation Regarding Development Scenarios  
Analysis and Draft Preferred Land Use Map and Proposed

## Development Strategy

DATE: July 23, 2015

### RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission make the following recommendations to the City Council:

- 1.) Accept the Draft Land Use Map as the Preferred Land Use Exhibit for the purposes of drafting the revised General Plan and General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
- 2.) Accept the Proposed Development Strategy as conceptual direction for key land use and related policies in the General Plan Update.
- 3.) Direct staff and the consultant team to prepare the Draft General Plan incorporating the Preferred Land Use Exhibit and proposed development strategy.

**Attachments:**     [1 - Minutes from the Planning Commission Meeting - Part 1](#)  
[2 - Development Scenario Analysis Summary](#)  
[3 - Examples of Infill Development Policies](#)  
[4 - Converted Farmland within Specific Plan Areas by Category](#)

*Commissioner Lizarraga made a motion to accept the staff proposal, with the addition that the 900 acres (SP 2) be included in the program level EIR clearance.*

*Commissioner Wells made a friendly amendment to that request, to also take out the language for SP-2 regarding flood and to include SP 3 to receive programmatic clearance under CEQA.*

*Commissioner Holt suggested amendment to Commissioner Wells request to only take out the portion of the trigger language that relates to funding and permits, and to revert to old language that says contingent upon a comprehensive flood solution.*

*Commissioner Wells restated his motion to say that it should revert to the old language and accepted Commission Holt's suggestion.*

*Commissioner Lampkin requested that the motion be restated.*

*Commissioner Lizarraga stated that he moves to accept staff recommendation and to add in that the EIR for the General Plan shall include the 900 acres and SP-3 for programmatic clearance.*

*Commission Holt asked if it also included reverting to the old language for SP 2. Commissioner Lizarraga agreed.*

*Commissioner Lampkin seconded the motion*

*Ken Hiatt asked for clarification regarding the motion and whether it included an amendment to the growth assumptions for the General Plan and EIR.*

*Commissioner Lizarraga stated that yes it does expand the development assumptions.*

*Commissioner Wells called for a vote: 7-0 in favor of the motion as clarified.*

*Summary of the Motion:*

*Move staff's recommendation, and include SP-2 and SP-3 as part of the programmatic CEQA clearance for the General Plan and modify the trigger language to revert to the old language (from the July 16 Preferred Plan map).*

*An amendment to the motion was added after discussion to expand the proposed build out assumptions as necessary to allow the inclusion of all the SP areas.*

*Motion: Lizarraga Second: Lampkin*

*7-0 in favor*

*NOTE: Detailed minutes for the July 23, 2015 General Plan discussion were prepared. They have been included as an attachment to these minutes.*

## **I. New Business**

*None provided*

## **J. Old Business**

*None provided*

## **K. Adjournment**

*Meeting adjourned at 9:35 pm*

**The Planning Commission of the City of Woodland encourages all parties interested in a matter scheduled to be reviewed, discussed and acted on at a meeting, to participate in the public discourse, which may include the submission of written comments and materials. The Planning Commission notifies the public that those materials received less than 24 hours before a meeting date and time may not be able to be considered completely. Further, the Planning Commission encourages interested parties to attend the meeting to discuss any matter of concern and to explain their comments more fully.**

## Woodland Planning Commission Session – Part 2

---

July 23, 2015, 6:30 pm  
City Council Chambers

### ATTENDANCE

All Commissioners were in attendance along with approximately 30 members of the public.

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

- *Elodia Ortega-Lampkin*: Regardless of what we decide, we will look at flood, correct?
  - *Sophie*: Yes
- *Elodia Ortega-Lampkin*: Any scenario will include the downtown area?
  - *Sophie*: Correct
- *Fred Lopez*: What does the “three years trigger” refer to? Three years after GP is adopted?
  - *Sophie*: Yes, the timing is based on adoption of the GP.
  - *Ken*: We are aiming for adoption in 12-18 months
- *Steve Harris*: Also, in terms of the SP-1 trigger, what does the 80% refer to?
  - *Sophie*: 80% buildout of approved units in Spring Lake
- *Fred Lopez*: Where are we today in terms of Spring Lake buildout?
  - *Ken*: Spring Lake is currently at about 35% buildout.
- *Fred Lopez*: Can you provide any more specifics about potential infill policies?
  - *Sophie*: That’s the type of policy we’d continue to flesh out moving forward. Examples were provided in the attachments for this meeting, but further specifics have not been drafted for Woodland yet. That will happen when the Land Use Element is drafted.
- *Chris Holt*: Will the flood project have it’s own EIR separate from this GP EIR?
  - *Sophie*: Yes
- *John Murphy*: Was the flood NOP for Cache Creek or the west levee?
  - *Ken*: It was for Cache Creek.
- *John Murphy*: And a comprehensive flood solution means a flood solution for both Cache Creek and the west levee?
  - *Ken*: Yes

- *John Murphy:* More specific language for flood constraints in the North Gateway is needed. It should match the flood language for SP-3.
  - *Sophie:* The language for the North Gateway is vague because some development might be possible with padding up.
- *Marco Lizarraga:* Are we choosing between scenarios?
  - *Sophie:* This map is a combination of the four scenarios. You are not being asked to choose between the scenarios. This is the alternative you are being asked to approve.
- *Marco Lizarraga:* What about the EIR?
  - *Sophie:* Before moving on to the EIR, we will have to draft a Project Description.
- *Steve Harris:* This has been a difficult process. Every option involves farmland, so you have to consider what impacts the least amount of farmland. I get frustrated trying to protect the farmland. But I guess if it's within the ULL, it's fair game. I know the city has to grow, but let's protect the farmland. We should do infill because that's what people want and it wouldn't affect farmland. What are we doing to encourage infill and higher density in the core?
  - *Ken:* Excellent questions. At this point, we're validating what we've heard from the community, and that's that infill is a priority. As we move forward, we'll work on crafting more meaningful policies and actions to make infill happen. The Commission will be involved in this process.
- *Steve Harris:* I wish I knew more about the flood issue. Will we be involved with that moving forward? It seems the flood could be tied to SP-2 and Conway Ranch and what happens out there.
- *Steve Harris:* What infrastructure is there in the North Gateway?
  - *Ken:* There's water and sewer near the interchange. We'd have to consider upsizing. We'll look at those specific issues as we refine the policies.
- *Kirby Wells:* That issue of "significantly restricts the city from advancing development" in SB 5 is solely for residential development? The limitation is for residential?
  - *Brent:* We're still digging into SB-5. At this point, there is allowance to continue padding up in the industrial area. We don't anticipate doing that for residential.
- *Kirby Wells:* How does the new map differ from last week's map?
  - *Sophie:* We've added additional language to SP-2 and SP-3 to be more clear about flood and when planning can proceed.
- *Kirby Wells:* I hate the idea of constraining ourselves by saying we won't do anything until flood is in place. Maybe amend the language to allow for specific solutions (padding up) if possible.

- *Sophie*: Are you referring to North Gateway area?
- *Kirby Wells*: Sure, let's start there. Language shouldn't be limited by flood if we can do a different work around.
  - *Sophie*: One of the concerns for this area is that some of that land might be involved in the flood solution.
- *Kirby Wells*: But we control that. I wonder why we want to close that door now.
  - *Ken*: Not trying to close the door, just want to indicate that the flood solution needs to be prioritized and happen first. We're open to development, but first we need to focus on the flood solution and getting protection in place.
- *Kirby*: Last week, the language was more flexible. The new map has more stringent language, saying we're not going to touch it until after a flood solution.
  - *Ken*: Yes, that was our attempt to clarify our intent. But, we're not closing the door on development.
- *Marco Lizarraga*: The new stronger language seems to conflict with SB 5. This says you either have a solution or not. That's not what SB 5 requires.
  - *Ken*: We believe it is consistent.
- *Marco Lizarraga*: SB 5 says you have to address the flood issue. This doesn't.
  - *Ken*: I think we're talking about semantics. We're saying development shouldn't occur until the flood solution is designed, engineered, financed....
- *Elodia Ortega-Lampkin*: For SP-2, you have more specific language. On the North Gateway area, it just says flood is a constraint.
  - *Ken*: Specific Plan processing is considered based on residential development. However, some limited amount of non-residential development could happen prior to a flood solution as long as it doesn't conflict with the future flood solution. In SP-2, we don't advise any non-residential development happen without a flood solution because of the infrastructure required and deeper flood depths.
- *Kirby Wells*: The trigger language for SP-1 would be cleaner if we just put a date. How would you feel if we took out the percentage piece and only put in a date?
  - *Ken*: The initial intent was to allow Spring Lake to buildout to a specific amount. But it was decided that we don't want landowners to have control by slowing building.
  - *Sophie*: The either/or allows you to move faster if the economy picks up. If Spring Lake achieves 80% sooner than 3 years, it allows you to move on sooner, rather than waiting for a specific date.
- *Kirby Wells*: But, we could pull out the percentage and say 3 years or City approval?

- *Sophie:* Yes
- *Ken:* The language is preliminary at this point. We will continue to fine tune.
- *John Murphy:* I like the percentage. We've seen the slow down in Spring Lake's development, and the amenities have not been built. If we start allowing development to happen elsewhere, then it will take even longer to get the amenities that people have been waiting for.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- *David Storer* (Knaggs Family Trust)
  - I'm the author of the memo that was provided to the Commission. I've modified the chart that showed farmland by area. I circled 3 land uses.
  - Prime ag land is a whole other category.
  - Specific Plans can be acted upon independently. The cost is passed on to the developer to process the risk.
  - SB 5: Before any jurisdiction can approve a ministerial permit, you have to show you're making progress toward a flood solution. There's many ways to do this. It alarms me that residential will not be included in the EIR in flood areas. SB 5 does not say that. I'd like for SPs to be able to tier off of the GP EIR.
    - *Marco Lizarraga:* SB 5 makes sense, but it's vague. It's possible to include residential zones in the EIR even without flood solution. So the recommendation should be to include that.
  - I'd like to have the whole area analyzed so that we can tier off of the GP EIR.
    - *Ken:* SB 5 does not preclude us from including residential, but we can't approve entitlements within the flood-affected area. Our policy suggestion is that it's not necessary to achieve our growth targets or needs, nor is it preferred. The focus should be on the flood solution and development on land that is not dependent on a flood solution.
    - *Kirby Wells:* To be clear, you're recommending that we're not including residential units on flood-affected land in the EIR?
    - *Ken:* That's correct.
    - *Heidi:* It's not a cost/benefit issue. It's more of a policy issue. Between infill, SLSP, and buildiout of SP-1A, you have enough development to accommodate growth within the planning horizon. You want to make sure that development in flood areas is brought into the city in a way that it contributes to the flood solution rather than interfere swith it. Right now, we should focus on the pieces that can move forward without it. You also

don't want to jeopardize State/Fed partnership with flood solution. We're trying to stay as flexible as possible, but we also don't want to go so far that we jeopardize solutions. If we hear additional info, there may be an opportunity to refine somewhat.

- *Chris Holt:* For the GP EIR, are we going to have the opportunity to approve the scoping of the EIR?
- *Heidi:* That could be the case. There can be a check-in about the Project Description, but it might be with the City Council instead.
- Perhaps the EIR could cover parts of the Knaggs property that are not affected by the 200 year flood plain.
- *Veronica Diaz* (Teamsters)
  - We're here in support of any plan that supports the relocation of our sprayfields from the 900 acres. Odor and flies have become an issue. Conway Ranch has said if the 900 acres is rezoned, they can help with disposal of wastewater in a way that is not harmful to others.
- *Tim Taron* (East Woodland LLC)
  - This is a really important decision. Once the preferred alternative is identified, there could be tweaking, but not a lot of change.
  - I have not heard staff once say "Prime Farmland." By delaying SP-2, Staff is slamming the door. It would require a brand new EIR, which means waiting a long time. The longer you wait, the more Prime Farmland will get gobbled up and irrevocably committed to development.
  - We think we should be allowed to plan SP-2 concurrently with flood plans so that they work together.
  - I disagree with the characterization of SB 5. It allows you to plan, but prohibits the city to issue building permits. You can certainly do what we're asking: Include SP-1A so that there is ready available land for new development, and also allow SP-2 to be planned now so it's ready to go when the flood solution is in place. That's the solution. It's a good balance. Development in SP-1A will give enough time for a flood solution to be finalized.
- *Robert Thomas* (General Manager of Conway Ranch)
  - Staff has misinterpreted SB 5.
  - PCP would prefer to relocate away from the urban area. They can't make that move unless you include the 900 acres in the preferred alternative. I'd hope you want your largest employer to be successful. If SP-2 is not in the preferred plan, they can't move.
  - Fifteen years ago, Davis, Woodland and UC Davis needed a new water supply. Five years ago, they came to Conway Ranch asking for surface water. There were many hurdles, but rather than throwing up our hands,

we put together an agreement that will give all three surface water next summer. Let me suggest that flood control is the same issue. There's no reason or state law that doesn't allow you to include the 900 acres in the preferred alternative. Because it's within your city limits, you want to plan that area. Not develop it (until there's a flood solution), but plan it. That east area is important to the water supply and flood control and rail relocation.

- Rail currently blocks 27 intersections in West Sacramento, Woodland and Davis. The preferred alternative for rail relocation is through Conway Ranch.
- We can't say we have to wait. We should be allowed to move forward with the planning process now, but building permits won't be issued until a flood solution is in place.
- The 900 acres has been heavily salted due to the PCP spray and will never be Prime Farmland.
- We need to send a strong message that we want flood protection.
- The 900 acres is the only project in the GP that brings new surface water to the table. Every other project relies on your current water sources.
- I would hope that the language in SP 2 be eliminated. This is not "new language," it is slamming the door on SP-2. It's a policy decision, not a legal issue. You have the ability to recommend to the City council that SP 2 be added in to the GP EIR. You have a right to proceed with a specific plan in that area.
  - *John Murphy:* Please clarify. What is the linkage between moving the spray field and development of the property. What is it that keeps that from being an available option right now?
- Linkage right now, 900 acres is owned by city with long term lease to PCP. The linkage is if they want to move, which they do, where will you move them. You'll probably move the sprayfields to Conway Ranch. How does that all work given relocation costs how that all fits into the puzzle.
  - *John Murphy:* But if the City lets them out of the lease, why can't it happen now? Is that independent of the development opportunity of the property. I don't understand why you are this linkage and why are you saying that cant happen without the specific plan. Are you talking about only talking about relocating the sprayfields, or relocating the cannery. It seems to me that when it is suggested that PCP be relocated it gives the impression that what is being talked about is relocating the factory. People may be confused that what is being talked about is relocation of the factory. But what we are really talking about is relocating the spray fields.

- *Bob Thomas*: That is correct we are only talking about the spray fields.
  - *Marco Lizarraga*: I'm been concerned about funding. If there is no planned development then there is no need for flood control. Would not have gotten funding for the Natomas area if there had not been planned development. The government won't fund a flood solution if we don't have planned development in flood-affected areas. If there's no intention to develop the area, we won't get the funding.
- We don't know what's going to happen over the life of the General Plan. Don't preclude your options. If the remainder area is able to get through their process first, they should be able to build, but they will have to go through about a two year process to get their EIR. Don't restrain with artificial triggers when we know that we need a flood solution for SP 2 and that they will have to go through tax sharing, annexation, EIR, mitigation for prime ag land. Don't restrain with artificial triggers. These artificial triggers are trying to direct development.
  - *Chris Holt*: If you go back to the artificial triggers, SP-1 has it's own problems, but that's not what's hindering SP-2 from going forward. What is hindering it is the need for a flood solution before you can pull a building permit. You have to pull a permit correct?
- If a developer wants to proceed with a SP at their risk and cost, and cant let all three go at once, if you allow that to occur you will have to have the developers pay for city staff, that is how you staff up, let them take that risk. But by delaying the planning process you are delaying ultimately what might occur there and I think it is sending the wrong message to the Federal and State Government, as Marco said, that this area is not a priority.
  - *Chris Holt*: But Skip Davies says we're closer to flood solution that we think. Theoretically, If we have that, and you secure a flood solution and we don't have the build out trigger of SL, then you can move forward. You're not limited by SP-1. What is hindering you is a flood solution
- What is hindering is the language that does not allow any planning to occur until there is a flood solution. I am saying that there is an opportunity to start the SP while we are figuring out the flood solution. It could be a parallel process. The SPs don't need to be sequential. I am suggesting that if the City send a strong message that we have land in the city that we plan on developing I think it helps sends a strong message to our Federal and State partners.
  - *John Murphy*: Staff I am confused between on what the retired city mangers in the audience are saying and the difference from

between restricting when an SP can be processed until, and you saying we should be allowed to start planning? Not sure about those terms and if there is overlap.

- Bob Thomas: Staff is recommending that the 900 acres not be part of preferred plan or EIR. Meaning SP-2 would require a GPA, which would take a long time. That means you won't be planning for 6 or 7 years.
  - *John Murphy:* Are we taking action on the preferred alternative? We're just saying this is the starting point, right?
  - *Ken:* It is a starting point for framing the preferred development projects that will be used to build the GP and the EIR.
  - *John Murphy:* It sounds like what we are hearing people object to is what will be studied in as the preferred plan GP EIR because it might give some projects a big head start over others based on what is included.
  - *Ken:* I would like to provide some distinction regarding the nuance of the language regarding striking the language regarding processing the application for a Specific Plan. This general plan does not suggest nor does it cover development in the 900 acres. What we are suggesting is that a SPs would need to be prepared and processed and still need a GPA and EIR. We are not suggesting anything different than Mr. Thomas. Under any scenario a SP in this area will require its own specific plan and its own environmental document.
  - *Chris Holt:* So that would be true for SP-3 and SP-1 same set of requirements, a Specific Plan, environmental analysis that would be on SP 2?
  - *Ken:* Correct.
- Bob Thomas: That's not correct. Because SP-2 will not be included in the preferred alternative or in the GP EIR. You know how long it can take to prepare an EIR that's the difference.
  - *Ken:* No land use assumptions during the horizon year would be included in the GP EIR. The GP EIR for SP-3 would only consider non-residential development. SP-1 would include the residential necessary to achieve our growth targets of 7,000 unit projection of SL, infill and SP-1 area. So there would be residential CEQA clearance for SP-1. As well as the commercial around the interchange. So there would be some CEQA clearance with this scenario.
  - *Chris Holt:* Not because SP-1 is more preferable, but because it already has laid more groundwork in sizing of infrastructure.
  - *Ken:* SP-1 will still need project level EIR and a Specific Plan

- *Chris Holt.* And the reason we are including SP-1 in our EIR is to allow us to satisfy our requirement in state law for adequate growth per the housing element.
    - *Marco Lizarraga:* Could we as a Commission direct you to include the 900 acres? If we don't have something to give these guys to fund, we won't get it.
- *David Storer:* This language is new to me tonight, so you're seeing the reaction that it is causing. My understanding with SP 3 was that we would be able to tier off of it. What I just heard Ken say is that a subsequent document would go along with that. The issue Tim is bringing up is that he feels he is not in the game, but I think that he is. What it says is "may not be processed." To me that is a discretionary not mandatory, not a shall. The point of staff. The point is with SP 3 is that I'd like to be able to tier off of the GP EIR and not have to do a GPA. I am not sure if Ken misspoke when he said General Plan amendment, but that is a big deal and changes the whole funding game.
- *Steve Knoll* (Design Workshop – for the Beeman Family)
  - Retained by the Beeman Family to help them determine the best use for their property. We think this preferred plan is generally pretty supportive of what we want to do. We think this is the appropriate time to step forward. We submitted an application for a GPA and annexation for SP-1A and part of the South Gateway area. We feel comfortable with what's being proposed.
  - Sp-1A: We think this project is well situated for the City to go forward with:
    - Supports orderly development because infrastructure has already been planned
    - Agriculture heritage – within ULL
    - Economic development – SFR, MFR, mixed use, commercial, and research will be a good balance for city.
    - Mobility – Plan will provide aggressive trail and parks system and will allow access by all modes
    - Recreation opportunities – Minimum of 6 acres of park if not more. Also greenways and neighborhood parks: It's the whole network.
    - Qualitative character – Design standards will enhance character of community and provide a strong neighborhood feeling.
    - Environmental stewardship – Low impact development, stormwater management
    - *John Murphy-* What's the timeframe?

- We've started by submitting the application. We're now looking at what could be supported on the property. We anticipate by end of GPU, we'll have a proposal in place.
- *Al Eby*
  - I'm concerned whether the GP will supersede the Downtown Specific Plan.
    - *Ken:* The GP will have policies that will set the tone for amendments to the Downtown SP. But it will stay in place.
  - Marco brought up the point of needing an incentive for flood funding. But they're incentives already in place. I'm not against the 900 acres, but we already have a need for flood protection based on existing development.
  - There shouldn't be triggers at all, instead I think it should be market driven. If they are willing to pay for the infrastructure then let them. It brings people in here. 1000 people employed at PCP that people will need homes. Don't support giving favoritism to one specific area.
- *Art Pimentel*
  - I am lifelong resident. Remind you of something I have been involved in with regard to developing principles in the GP. That the people and CC will drive what will happen in the future. People submitted 3,100 postcards, and one of the top items was the protecting prime farmland was a big priority.
  - Also, the other priority was developing a flood solution. Especially for residents in the northside. That should be a significant priority for the residential areas and industrial area to the north, I believe that there are community partnerships that are available to assist the city in developing that. Rezoning those 900
  - The city owns the 900 acres and we should be creating value for the community with those 900 acres.
  - I don't understand the new language. It should be the intention of including as much potential development as possible to allow for planning for the future. We understand in a lot of these areas, nothing can be built until a flood solution is in place. Also including planning for the railroad realignment and preserving the 1000 plus jobs that exist at PCP.
    - *John Murphy:* What was the form of the input of the 3100 postcards?
  - People sent them in and people contacted me. There are a lot of people in this community who don't know about general plans but they do care about this community. I don't know who and how and what drove people to submit those postcards, but I was one of those who submitted

one. One of those who support those 9 principals that were on that postcard.

- *Jenny Lilge*
  - Felt compelled to speak because Art brought up the postcards. May feel that the postcards were submitted under a cloak of deception. They are about promoting a argument for building in the 900 acres. When I asked one person why she supported building in the 900 acres that by placing her name on the postcard, she didn't understand that's what the postcard said. That is not what I intended.
  - We have a lot of money that could be made off of the 900 acres, and that money funneling this behind the scenes behavior.
  - Is sprawling far east the best for Woodland?
  - A responsible footprint for our town and look at responsible growth that promotes infill is best. We want smart growth.
  - I support triggers because we want smart growth. That's why they are doing this analysis - to see what things are going to cost. We want to know what things are going to cost before we start doing things that will cause damage and before they cant be undone.
  - Talk to your neighbors. Do you want 15,000 more people in this town. Talk to your neighbors. Don't buy into what is being funded by developers who stand to make millions.

## **COMMISSION COMMENTS**

- *Elodia Ortega-Lampkin*
  - Reality is, no matter which way it goes, there is money and stakeholders involved, and someone will benefit. Stakeholders and agendas.
  - I do take the postcards seriously because they represent what people think. Look our for the interests of regular folks.
  - I think it would be in our best interest to look into all of the possibilities.
  - It would be a mistake to not allow healthy competition among developers for where to grow. The developers should pay for some of the costs. See who will give us the best options. It is unrealistic for us to not understand that we will grow. We should take advantage of the developers who can pay for the improvements and take it off our taxes.
  - Agricultural land is huge for me and for our future generations. I value it and our community values it.
  - Have developers pay the cost to make development happen.
- *Fred Lopez*
  - Flood still concerns me. If we address the flood issue now, it might be more work, but it will be more expensive to wait until 5-10 years down

the road. All of the area within the ULL should be included within the flood solution. May be more work now, but it will be more expensive down the road. SP 3 area, easier to deal with than that vacant land. Create a blueprint for what we want now. Understand that we have some funding toward that now, we should utilize the funding we have now to get that corrected. So everyone knows what can be built, when it can be built and where it can be built.

- *Chris Holt*
  - Writing ideas down on postits.
  - Ultimately we can't control alone where our city develops – a lot is driven by the market controls this too. But we can level the playing field and help guide growth to where it most advantageous for our community.
  - We have to be at the table and consider all comers not shut people out based on different ideals.
  - I prefer compact development, urban infill walkable, non auto-centric options.
  - If we include the 900 acres, we have essentially planned out the majority of the ULL. The ULL can't move easily. Ask Elk Grove about that and the problems they are experiencing. We shouldn't take that lightly.
  - There are many elements that contribute to developing in the downtown. Rail relocation and finding a flood solution are huge. We can ask people in the industrial area to keep padding up, but at some point it becomes cheaper to build elsewhere that doesn't require flood mitigation. At some time we need a solution for our residents.
  - In order to achieve our goals and work with partners we have to be at the table with them. At some point Conway Ranch has lots of very good things that we need to solve some of our problems flood and rail relocation and PCP spray fields. We'd be disingenuous if we expected Conway to give us all of this, without expecting something back.
  - Their interest in the 900 acres can be a benefit, but we need to plan it correctly:
    - I do not feel that this location is appropriate for residential development at all.
    - I think we should consider uses that do not make sense in the urban core any longer and relocate those uses to the 900 acres. (For example, Cal West Seeds could move out to there where it's near rail; also the PCP factory could be relocated off main street – so they can expand elsewhere.)
  - Instead of pitting one piece of development against another, we need to look at what they can be for our future.

- Downtown – Loss of redevelopment took the wind out of our sails by removing a significant funding mechanism. That did not end redevelopment. The example of Visalia’s infill development program is a great example of how you can increase infill Downtown and level the playing field. Additionally, there are also nonprofits in communities around us that serve as good examples. (Roseville Community Development Corporation is teaming with the City to bring in funding sources for their downtown.)
- Need to focus on flood and rail relocation or there will be a lot of things we will need to live with for the next 30-35 years.
- Would suggest raising the minimum FARs for urban infill and downtown areas – minimum of 1.0 on non-residential FARs. By raising the lower threshold, you start to see much more dense development. By doing this and lessening parking requirements, we can see something closer to Davis and Downtown Sacramento.
- *John Murphy*
  - Like idea of moving PCP to the 900 acres. Or maybe the County fairgrounds. Interstate Oil is another industrial use that would be more appropriate out east. Also the parking in the non-customer service part of the post office could be used better, so perhaps relocate them.
  - Support completing Spring Lake. Yes, this is playing favorites. That’s what policies are. Spring Lake has to be finished. We can’t do anything that would slow this down.
  - MPRA – SP-1A makes the most sense; also willing to consider 1B and 1C.
    - I think Prime Farmland is a complete red herring. We’ve already voted on it and settled the matter. The community has spoken.
  - North area – It is nice in terms of maintaining the shape of the city and keeping downtown downtown. Kentucky has historically been a corridor for farm traffic. Development will be a challenge because we’ll always have that corridor separating the north part from downtown.
  - East area– This is the only asset that the city has. I’m fine with it as it is now, but I’m still a little confused about what we’re approving here and what people think will be in an EIR based on this. We need to maximize the value of this property. If it needs to be in an EIR, then that’s what we should do. I agree with Chris, I can’t see development out there, but I’m not a developer.
- *Marco Lizarraga*
  - Favorable to relocating rail. That’s a must. Also favorable to prioritizing a flood solution.
  - In favor of infill. We need to incentivize this type of development.
  - Spring Lake – No one disagrees with that.

- We all need to direct staff to include the 900 acres in the EIR. There's never too many incentives to have the government fund anything.
- *Steve Harris*
  - I agree with everything everyone has to say.
  - Flood protection is the key to everything.
  - Conway Ranch is a good business partner that we are lucky to have. I don't like turning away business. I think everyone should be included, rather than shutting people out.
  - We all know we have a commitment to Spring Lake. It should be given every opportunity to be built out.
  - Supportive of the Downtown SP area. Food trucks, Friday night art walk, it's an absolute delight.
  - I think everything needs to go under the umbrella of the EIR, including the 900 acres.
- *Kirby Wells*
  - The success of our city is driven by the unique, historic downtown. For the longest time, it hasn't been designed to attract the businesses we need. It is critical how we design the entry points in the south and north to bring people into the downtown area. We have to make Woodland look attractive and pull commerce in into the downtown area.
  - Let the market drive some of our opportunities. If the developers want to start planning, I recommend that we don't stop that.
    - Include all North Gateway properties in EIR and the 900 acres
    - Triggers for Spring Lake – No percentage. Hard, solid date only. The market will drive the percentage that gets built.

## **FINAL QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION**

- *Fred Lopez*: If we accept this preferred plan, but want to include flood-affected residential and the 900 acres in the EIR, can that happen?
  - *Ken*: The Commission can certainly entertain that.
- *Fred Lopez*: If that's doable?
  - *Ken*: In terms of our scope, it could add cost and time to include assumptions about these SPs
- *Chris Holt*: If we add all of the SPs to the EIR, don't we have to assume land uses and development densities? Does it lock us into a development pattern we don't want?
  - *Ken*: The scope and cost might not change as long as we maintain a program level EIR and not project level.

- *Heidi*: There is land use assigned to the entire map. What we need to figure out is what is assumed by 2035. Full buildout would be way more than the target's we've identified. It doesn't have a material affect on the scope of the EIR. Full buildout would require more mitigations. It's a policy question, it's not about the scope of work. We can assume the number of units and intensity that you and the City Council tell us to.
- *Fred Lopez*: SP-1A plan will be done by end of GPU. Looking at SP-1A, it's about half of proposed 7,000 figure in that development alone.
  - *Sophie*: We have not done any traffic assessment on development on every parcel. This would create extra cost if we assume more development than we did in any of the scenarios. As for SP-1A, it is possible that the EIR could be expanded to cover SP-1A at a project level if the budget is increased.
- *Chris Holt*: What's the difference between a programmatic and project EIR?
  - *Sophie*: Programmatic EIR assumes a range of development, and provides blanket clearance for projects that are not yet known. You see the difference in significant impacts. For a Project EIR, the impacts are known and can be evaluated at a more specific level. Mitigations in a Programmatic EIR could say, "Specific projects that fall under these categories would require x, y and z mitigations." If projects are consistent with the approach of the GP, projects could tier off of the GP EIR and only consider project level impacts.
- *Chris Holt*: I would suggest consistency. If we do a Project EIR for one, we should do it for all. Or at least allow the opportunity for all.
  - *Sophie*: We are only scoped for a Program EIR. Part of this is because we don't know what project proposals look like for the SPs.

## **ACTION**

- *Marco Lizarraga*: I'd like to propose we accept Staff recommendation and expand the EIR to include the 900 acres.
- *Kirby Wells*: I'd suggest we remove the new specific flood language out for SP-2. Also, include SP-3 in the EIR.
- *Chris Holt*: I think it's dangerous to allow full development of a SP without tying it to a flood solution. I'd suggest we revert to the old language. The new language is too restrictive.
- *Kirby Wells*: Go back to language saying it's contingent on identifying comprehensive flood solution, as we did before. As long as planning can start before.
- *Marco Lizarraga*: Motion: Accepting that we will expand EIR to include 900 acres and SP-3.
- *Elodia Ortega-Lampkin*: Second

- *Ken:* You are asking for amendments to the proposed buildout assumptions?
- *Marco Lizarraga:* Yes, you'd have to expand that.
- Motion <sup>2</sup>carries: All in favor.