

## **GPSC Meeting #6 NOTES**

---

May 4, 2016

6:00 – 8:00 pm

City Council Chambers

### **ATTENDEES**

#### **General Plan Steering Committee**

- Al Eby
- Evelia Genera
- Chris Holt
- Don Sharp
- Kathy Trott

#### **Others**

- 11 members of the public
- Art Pimentel, Anthony Garcia, Christian Mendoza, Melanie Mathews, Xochitl Rodriguez, Deborah Zavala, Teri Stark, Al Terreccro (?), Skip Davies, Chad Roberts, Angel Barajas.

#### **City Staff and Consultants**

- Ken Hiatt, City of Woodland
- Cindy Norris, City of Woodland
- Heidi Tschudin, Tschudin Consulting Group
- Sophie Martin, Dyett & Bhatia
- Elizabeth Schmid, Dyett & Bhatia

### **GPSC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS SUMMARY NOTES**

- *Evelia Genera*: What was the reason the City Council wanted to analyze two General Plan Alternatives at an equal level of detail in the EIR?
  - *Sophie Martin*: The Council wanted additional information on the environmental impacts of each Alternative before making a final decision as to which should be put forward in the final Plan.

- *Ken Hiatt:* It will also allow some CEQA streamlining benefit in the future if the City ultimately decides to alter its development phasing plan.
- *Kathy Trott:* Will hard copies of the Public Review Draft be available for General Plan Steering Committee members?
  - *Cindy Norris:* Yes.
  - *Ken Hiatt:* If anyone doesn't want a hard copy, let us know.
- *Evelia Genera:* The topic of public schools has been raised repeatedly throughout this process. I hope that this is addressed somewhere in the Plan. We need to address the perception and reality of how good or bad our schools are. From what I can see, higher education is mentioned once in the goals, and K-12 isn't mentioned at all. How are we going to prioritize our K-12 schools and higher education institutions?
  - *Ken Hiatt:* Goal 4.E is focused on education. As you'll see in the Public Review Draft, this goal is accompanied by a number of policies that provide more detail. In addition, the implementation programs in the appendix will list the city departments that are responsible for carrying out each program. Also, keep in mind the difference between goals, policies, and programs. When making comments, think about what should be a policy versus what should be a program.
- *Evelia Genera:* Sustainability and climate change are also big topics for me. It seems like the policies will provide more of an action plan, so I'll look forward to seeing those. From what I'm reading so far, it looks like this could have been a document drafted in 2014 in regards to how it is addressing climate change. Climate change is related to many of the topics addressed in this Plan, including housing, mobility, and safety.
  - *Sophie Martin:* The City and community have already put a lot of effort into drafting a preliminary Climate Action Plan. We are using this draft as the starting point for updating that document. The main change will be the addition of new targets that align with State law and the General Plan horizon year (2035).
- *Kathy Trott:* If you're targeting releasing the Public Review Draft on July 1, when will the implementation programs be released?
  - *Ken Hiatt:* The goal will be to release them along with the Public Review Draft, but we also don't want to hold up the release of that document if the implementation programs aren't ready yet.
  - *Kathy Trott:* It seems like we will need to see both together.
- *Kathy Trott:* How much time will we have to review the Public Review Draft before the next meeting?
  - *Heidi Tschudin:* To clarify, we will only be asking you to identify some general topics and areas of interest prior to the next meeting. The

expectation will not be that you have read and commented on the entire document.

- *Sophie Martin*: Right, we'll be working at a topical level, not at a word smithing level. We are more than happy to receive your individual comments after the meeting, but you will have the full public comment period to provide those.
- *Evelia Genera*: The other topic I'd like to see more on is flooding. I know the flood committee is working on that issue, but I'm hoping that the flood group can come together with the General Plan group, and we can make some decisions on that topic. We can't move forward until that happens.
- *Evelia Genera*: Are there requirements for the Specific Plans in terms of renewal and revisiting? Or are they living, working docs?
  - *Sophie Martin*: Should the City choose to do a Specific Plan, there are requirements for what that needs to include. It's still a plan and it is adopted.
  - *Heidi Tschudin*: Table 1-1 in the Introduction chapter lists existing plans, and explains what will be necessary to align them with the General Plan. The timing will be up to the City. However, they will need to be updated to align with the General Plan before they are used.
- *Chris Holt*: When do Specific Plan land uses get defined? Knowing the specific land uses will help me decide which Alternative I feel comfortable with.
  - *Sophie Martin*: Some broad parameters are defined in the General Plan document, including an overall density average, targets for the residential/non res mix, and policies regarding connectivity, sustainability, employment centers, etc. But the specific land uses and patterns will be developed during the Specific Plan process.
  - *Ken Hiatt*: We made some assumptions about the land uses in each Specific Plan area for the purposes of the EIR. If the eventual Specific Plan aligns with these assumptions, it can tier off of the General Plan EIR. If not, the Specific Plan will require additional environmental review.
  - *Chris Holt*: SP-2 is a large chunk of land. The mix of what it becomes is important to me. I don't want it to become mostly housing with commercial centers along the freeway. My support for that alternative in particular hinges on what the EIR looks at in terms of its assumed land uses. I'd like it to be more industrial leaning because of flood concerns, rail proximity, etc. I understand that we don't want to limit the free market, but we can't leave it completely open as to how that area would develop. Look at Roseville and others - that is what happened there.
  - *Ken Hiatt*: Policy language in the General Plan speaks to these ideas - mix of residential and non-residential uses, jobs/housing balance, greenhouse gas emission reductions, and transportation. We're working

through this language and trying to ensure that future growth areas look like we want them too.

- *Chris Holt:* So the Public Review Draft will contain some of this language?
  - *Ken Hiatt:* Yes.
- *Sophie Martin:* The City Council asked to see two Alternatives that have the same number of housing units. So there are residential units out in SP-2 for Alternative 3 to ensure that the total number of new units is the same for both Alternatives.
- *Chris Holt:* Can the 7,000 units fit in SP-1 and SP-3?
  - *Ken Hiatt:* Yes. That option is explored in Alternative 2.
- *Kathy Trott:* How many people per unit?
  - *Sophie Martin:* That assumption is based on what Woodland has now, which is 2.9 people per housing unit.
- *Kathy Trott:* Did the City Council give a population number?
  - *Ken Hiatt:* No, they specified 7,000 units.
- *Evelia Genera:* Yes, there was a lot of discussion about this, and we all landed on 7,000 units.
- *Kathy Trott:* When would the General Plan go into effect?
  - *Sophie Martin:* As soon as it's adopted.
- *Chris Holt:* The red in the Southern Gateway - is that included in both Alternatives?
  - *Sophie Martin:* Yes, it is in both.
  - *Elizabeth Schmid:* This area on both sides of the freeway is assumed to develop regardless of which Alternative is chosen.
  - *Sophie Martin:* Investment in this area will help bolster the gateway and provide employment opportunities that are closer to Davis.
- *Don Sharp:* It looks like the Plan area extends south of CR 25A. I thought the vote said that we would not do this.
  - *Ken Hiatt:* The boundary of this Plan exactly aligns with the voter approved Urban Limit Line.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- I see the flood goal, but not one on rail relocation. That's a public safety issue. Where is that covered?
  - *Ken Hiatt:* It doesn't show up in the goals, because it's in a policy. The Council can choose to elevate this topic to the goal level if they choose.

- Yes, we are working so hard on rail relocation, it would be good to have this explicitly stated as a goal.
- Is this timeline realistic? The Plan will be adopted this winter?
  - *Ken Hiatt:* While it's achievable, it's going to require a concerted effort to stay the course. Also, timing for the remaining tasks is subject to some things that are out of our control, such as the number of comments we receive on the EIR. We are working hard to stick to this schedule.
  - *Evelia Genera:* It is important to get to the Public Review Draft out ASAP and make people aware of that.
- I didn't receive a mailer survey. This means the needs of my family weren't addressed.
  - *Cindy Norris:* It was distributed in April 2013. On the General Plan website, you can see the survey and its results.
  - Was it provided in Spanish and English?
    - *Cindy Norris:* Yes
  - *Ken Hiatt:* And please still provide comments, we will take them.
  - *Cindy Norris:* There's a link to provide comments on the project website.

Attachment:

- A. Comments provided by Evelia Genera at the meeting end.
- B. Sign in Sheets

## GENERAL PLAN COMMENTS

Submitted by Evelia R. Genera, 5/4/16

### Pg.1-1 GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS

“ A city’s general plan has been describes as the framework within which decisions are to be made on how to grow, provide public services and facilities, and protect and enhance the environment. i

### SUSTAINABILITY/CLIMATE CHANGE

- The plan needs to address climate change, green development, zero emissions and sustainability throughout the document. This is not the case in the current draft. Seems this draft is dated back to 2014 not 2016. In searching the whole document for "climate" there were just 2 mentions and 4 mentions for "greenhouse" as in emissions or gas. The whole document needs a green painting. The Climate Action Plan is listed as an appendix - but climate change planning cannot just be an appendix.
- Specific suggestions - include climate in the vision statement. So in addition to what is in the vision statement -which is fine- something like -"*Woodland will be a community very attuned to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in all its activities, including transportation and buildings and will be closing in on the goal of zero emissions by 2035. It will also focus not just on mitigating climate change by reducing greenhouse gases but also on making the community resilient to the effects of climate change*" Woodland did join the Paris Pledge for Action on Earth Day and that does say we will aim to keep the temperature rise to 2 degrees C - as we are already at 1 degree C - the only way to get there is by aiming for zero emissions and fast.
- So in addition to being in the vision statement, it should also be in some or all of the guiding principles. So for e.g.
  - In mobility options include also that we will aim to get transportation emissions in the city as low as possible and that this would include efforts to aid in the electrification or other zero emission technology for vehicle transportation.
  - In housing options - in addition to home size, etc. - include the goal of new homes being net zero emissions and somewhere there has to be something about helping to transition the existing house stock to lower emissions – “Is this specified in the Housing Plan?”
  - In safety – there is mention of natural as well as manmade hazards - need to include planning for climate resilience here - specifics for that would be heat waves, droughts, floods, new diseases ( ala mosquitoes, etc.) - maybe the specifics don't go here but somewhere else in document - but the basic idea of climate residence should be included.

- o in Environmental stewardship - mention zero emissions again here and maybe say we will be a leader as a small ag community in addressing both mitigation and adaptation to climate change.

## EDUCATION/SCHOOLS

### Pg. I-II GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS

“Comprehensive... the general plan must address the full range of issues that affect the city’s physical development.”

At almost every meeting around the general plan our schools have been criticized and comments made that it’s our schools which will draw people (residents/businesses) to our city.

“Because anticipated development will affect the city and the people who live or work there for years, state law requires every general plan take a long-term perspective.”

**Goal 4.E Educational Opportunities.** Indicates working cooperatively with school districts, private schools and higher education institutions to provide superior educational opportunities for all members of the Woodland Community.” What are the actions/policies which will support and create “superior educational opportunities”?

### **Goal 8.G Strong Partnerships.**

This plan must include clear, specific, intentional statements regarding partnerships with our K-12 educational systems. (Physical plants, needs assessments, etc.) As our city grows what are the provisions for building schools? How does the city work with our local schools not just higher education to support bonds?

GENERAL PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE SIGN IN SHEET

MAY 4, 2016

NAME (Print)	EMAIL	ADDRESS/PHONE
Xochitl Rodriguez	xochitl.r.munillo@gmail.com	908 Donner Way Woodland CA 95695 (530) 848-5010
Deborah Zavala <sup>11/3/15</sup>	diselazavala@gmail.com	19 Pershing Ave. 95095 530-908-9642
Teri Stark	t.stark57@yahoo.com	457 Cottonwood, 530-383-5778
Al Tercone	"	"



GENERAL PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE SIGN IN SHEET  
MAY 4, 2016

NAME (Print)	EMAIL	ADDRESS/PHONE
Art Pimentel	art.pimentel2007@yahoo.com	604 Elm Street
Evelin R. Genera	_____	_____
Don Sharp	donsharp977@yahoo.com	
Kathy Trott	Kathytrott@t-trott.com	715 Elm
CHRIS HOLT	CHRIS.HOLT2@CITYOFWOODLAND.ORG	1607 FIRST STREET
Anthony Garcia	_____	_____
Christian Mendez	_____	_____
Melanie Mathews		