



Agenda Item: _____

Meeting Date: _____

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

TO: John M. Bramble, City Manager

FROM: Kim Espinosa, Planning Manager

DATE: December 15, 2011

SUBJECT: Adoption of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and Certification of the General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

REPORT IN BRIEF

After the continued public hearing, the City Council will consider adoption of one of three options for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and its associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or direct staff to prepare other options.

RECOMMENDATION:

City Council: Adopt a motion:

Option 2—EIR Alternative #2 (Removing Castle Farms & Mission Lakes)

- A. *Action Already Completed:* Approving Resolution #2011-63--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Approving and Certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*, Making Findings and Determinations, Adopting a Statement of Facts and Overriding Considerations, and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program (Attachment 11); and,
- B. *Action Needed:* Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Adopting the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* (Attachment 12); (Please note that 7 separate votes will need to be taken on the Land Use Diagram per the Sectors on Attachment 1B plus 1 vote overall):
1. Sector I; and,
 2. Sector II; and,
 3. Sector III; and,
 4. Sector IV; and,
 5. Sector V; and,
 6. Sector VI; and,
 7. Sector VII; and,
 8. General Plan Resolution (above); and,

- C. *Action Needed:* Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Making Application to the Local Agency Formation Commission for Expansion of the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) (Attachment 13).

OR

Option 1—Draft General Plan (Planning Commission Recommendation)

- D. Rescinding Resolution #2011-63—A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Approving and Certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*, Making Findings and Determinations, Adopting a Statement of Facts and Overriding Considerations, and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program (Attachment 11) (Previously Adopted by the City Council on October 17, 2011, for Option 2); and,
- E. Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Approving and Certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*, Making Findings and Determinations, Adopting a Statement of Facts and Overriding Considerations, and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program (Attachment 8); and,
- F. Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Adopting the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* (Attachment 9); (Please note that 9 separate votes will need to be taken on the Land Use Diagram per the Sectors on Attachment 1A plus 1 vote overall):
1. Sector I; and,
 2. Sector II; and,
 3. Sector III; and,
 4. Sector IV; and,
 5. Sector V; and,
 6. Sector VI; and,
 7. Sector VII; and,
 8. Sector VIII; and,
 9. Sector IX; and,
 10. General Plan Resolution (above); and,
- G. Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Making Application to the Local Agency Formation Commission for Expansion of the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) (Attachment 10).

OR

Option 3—Modified EIR Alternative #2 (Removing Mission Lakes Only)

- H. Rescinding Resolution #2011-63—A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Approving and Certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*, Making Findings and Determinations, Adopting a Statement of Facts and Overriding Considerations, and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program (Attachment 11) (Previously Adopted by the City Council on October 17, 2011, for Option 2); and,
- I. Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Approving and Certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*, Making Findings and Determinations, Adopting a Statement of Facts and Overriding Considerations, and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program (Attachment 14); and,
- J. Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Adopting the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* (Attachment 15); (Please note that 8 separate votes will need to be taken on the Land Use Diagram per the Sectors on Attachment 1C plus 1 vote overall):
 - 1. Sector I; and,
 - 2. Sector II; and,
 - 3. Sector III; and,
 - 4. Sector IV; and,
 - 5. Sector V; and,
 - 6. Sector VI; and,
 - 7. Sector VII; and,
 - 8. Sector VIII; and,
 - 9. General Plan Resolution (above); and,
- K. Approving Resolution #2012-__--A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Merced, California, Making Application to the Local Agency Formation Commission for Expansion of the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) (Attachment 16).

POSSIBLE CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

- 1. Approve Option 2 (EIR Alternative #2), including Resolutions at Attachments 11 (already completed), 12, and 13; or,
- 2. After rescinding previously adopted Resolution #2011-63 for the EIR for Option 2, Approve Option 1 (Original Draft General Plan), as recommended by the Planning Commission, including Resolutions at Attachments 8, 9, and 10; or,

3. After rescinding previously adopted Resolution #2011-63 for the EIR for Option 2, Approve Option 3 (Modified EIR Alternative #2A), including Resolutions at Attachments 14, 15, and 16; or,
4. Direct staff to prepare Option #4 (Removal of the White Gate/Robinson Estates Area) for further consideration at future Planning Commission and City Council public hearings, according to the process as outlined in this administrative report; or,
5. Approve either Option 1, Option 2, or Option 3 and direct staff to begin a separate General Plan Amendment process to remove the White Gate/Robinson Estates area from the SUDP/Sphere of Influence; or,
6. Refer back to staff with other specific boundaries that are proposed for the General Plan so a determination can be made regarding costs, environmental review, and public hearing process; or,
7. Continue item to another future Council meeting (date and time to be specified in City Council motion).

AUTHORITY/CODE SECTIONS

Under California Government Code Section 65358(a), a legislative body may amend, after a public hearing, all or part of an adopted General Plan if the body deems the amendment to be in the public's interest. Title 19 of the Merced Municipal Code outlines environmental review procedures.

DISCUSSION:

Previous City Council Actions

September 19, 2011, City Council Meeting

On September 19, 2011, the City Council held a public hearing on the proposed *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Seven (7) individuals testified with several supporting adoption of the General Plan as proposed and several asking that the proposed growth boundary (Specific Urban Development Plan/Sphere of Influence or SUDP/SOI) be reduced in size.

During the subsequent City Council discussion, Council Members expressed a desire to reduce the proposed growth boundary in size by taking out both Castle Farms and Mission Lakes (proposed Community Plan areas in northwest and southwest Merced respectively), taking out just Mission Lakes, or taking out additional undefined areas. Support was expressed for leaving any areas taken out of the proposed growth boundary in the Area of Interest and for leaving the UC Merced and University Community areas in the growth boundary.

At the end of the City Council discussion, staff clarified that the City Council wished to look at 3 possible options for adopting the General Plan and Final EIR:

Option 1--the original proposal as recommended by the Planning Commission; Option 2--based on EIR Alternative #2 (removing both Castle Farms and Mission Lakes from the growth boundary); or Option 3--a modified EIR Alternative #2 (removing only Mission Lakes). Maps of each of these options (in comparison to the current City limits and the adopted 1997 General Plan boundaries) can be seen at Attachments 2A, 2B, 2C, and 2D. The public hearing was continued to October 17, 2011.

October 17, 2011, City Council Meeting

The City Council held a continued public hearing on the General Plan on October 17, 2011, with 7 individuals testifying. After the public hearing, the City Council adopted Resolution #2011-63, which approved and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*, made findings and determinations, adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations tailored specifically for Option 2 (deletion of Mission Lakes and Castle Farms Community Plans from the General Plan), and adopted a Mitigation Monitoring Program. Because there were not four affirmative votes to approve Section II of the Land Use Diagram, the City Council did not vote on whether to adopt a resolution that approved Option 2 as the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*. The final action was to continue the hearing to November 7, 2011.

November 7, 2011, City Council Meeting

On November 7, 2011, the City Council held a continued public hearing on the proposed *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* with 7 individuals testifying, including several individuals that wished to see the White Gate/Robinson Estates area east of McKee removed from the growth boundary and other reduced boundary options. One individual asked the Council to adopt one of the original 3 options and not spend any more time or resources on the process.

The City Council, on a 4-3 vote, adopted a motion to refer the matter back to staff to study a modified Option 2 with the removal of the White Gate/Robinson Estates areas (generally east of McKee Road and the current City Limits, south of Black Rascal Creek, and north of Stretch Road), which is now known as Option 4 (Attachment 2D). A separate motion was then made to continue the public hearing to the January 3, 2012, City Council meeting.

December 5, 2011, City Council Meeting

At the December 5, 2011, meeting, staff asked the City Council to confirm the previous City Council direction given on November 7, 2011, and/or to provide specific direction on other options (besides Option 4 above) the City Council would like to receive information regarding possible costs and process requirements on January 3. By a 5-1-1 vote (5 ayes, 1 no, 1 absent), the City

Council confirmed the previous direction and did not elect to consider any more options.

Previous Administrative Reports

Please refer to the previous administrative reports prepared for this item for the September 19, October 17, and November 7 City Council meetings at Attachments 3A, 3B, and 3C for detailed information regarding the project background, the three options, the Planning Commission recommendation, the preparation of the environmental impact report, the public review process, etc. The attachments for each administrative report have been deleted to avoid confusion and duplication since the most up-to-date version of each attachment is an attachment to this administrative report for January 3, 2012. For example, all the resolutions have been updated to reflect the current public hearing dates and the Land Use Diagram Sector Maps have been redrawn for the new City Council Members.

OPTIONS

Options 1, 2, and 3

Per the direction from the City Council on October 17, City staff and the consultants prepared three (3) possible options for the City Council's consideration on the General Plan and EIR as follows:

- 1) Option 1—Draft General Plan (Planning Commission Recommendation): Option 1 is the Planning Commission recommendation, which is the Draft *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* (August 2010) with minor modifications to the General Plan document and Land Use Diagram as outlined in Exhibits B and C of Attachment 9. The proposed SUDP/SOI boundary for Option 1 is 33,576 acres (Exhibit A of Attachment 10) and proposes large Community Plan areas, including Castle Farms, Mission Lakes, Yosemite Lakes, the UC Merced Campus, and University Community, along with some other minor additions to the existing SUDP (20,700 acres) adopted in 1997 with the *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan*.

Three resolutions have been prepared for this option at Attachments 8, 9, and 10—1 for the Final EIR, 1 for the General Plan document and Land Use Diagram, and 1 for the application to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for a modified Sphere of Influence. Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, a Mitigation Monitoring Program, and an Errata Sheet have been prepared for adoption of the Final EIR as seen in Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 of Attachment 8. However, if the City Council should elect to adopt Option 1, it must first rescind approval of Resolution #2011-63 (Attachment 11), which approved the EIR for Option 2 (below) on October 17, 2011.

- 2) Option 2—EIR Alternative #2 (Removing Castle Farms & Mission Lakes):
Option 2 is EIR Alternative #2 as described in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR. Option 2 includes a proposed SUDP/SOI of approximately 28,576 acres (Exhibit A of Attachment 13), removing Castle Farms and Mission Lakes (approximately 2,500 acres each) from the proposed SUDP/SOI but including them in the Area of Interest, which will now be 15,000 acres instead of 10,000 acres in Option 1.

The three (3) resolutions for this option appear at Attachments 11, 12, and 13. Please note that Resolution #2011-63 for the EIR was already adopted on October 17, 2011 (Attachment 11). Although the resolutions themselves are substantially the same as Option 1, the exhibits have been modified. More substantial modifications needed to be made to both the General Plan document and Land Use Diagram to remove Castle Farms and Mission Lakes from the SUDP/SOI, to reduce the size of the proposed SUDP/SOI, and to increase the size of the Area of Interest in addition to the minor modifications already proposed in Option 1. These changes are outlined in Exhibits B and C of Attachment 12. The LAFCO resolution also needed to be modified to reflect a modified Sphere of Influence for Option 2 (Attachment 13).

- 3) Option 3—Modified EIR Alternative #2A (Removing Mission Lakes Only):
Option 3 is a modification to EIR Alternative #2 (now known as EIR Alternative #2A), that only removes Mission Lakes from the proposed SUDP/SOI, which would now consist of approximately 31,076 acres (Exhibit A of Attachment 16). Mission Lakes would remain in the Area of Interest, however, which will now be approximately 12,500 acres.

Again, three (3) resolutions have been prepared for this option at Attachments 14, 15, and 16. However, if the City Council should elect to adopt Option 3, it must first rescind approval of Resolution #2011-63 (Attachment 11), which approved the EIR for Option 2 on October 17, 2011. Although the resolutions themselves are substantially the same as Options 1 and 2, the exhibits have been modified. More substantial modifications needed to be made to both the General Plan document and Land Use Diagram to remove Mission Lakes from the SUDP/SOI, to reduce the size of the proposed SUDP/SOI, and to increase the size of the Area of Interest in addition to the minor modifications already proposed in Option 1. These changes are outlined in Exhibits B and C of Attachment 15.

The Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations also needed to be modified to reflect the adoption of a modification to EIR Alternative #2, which can be seen in Exhibit 1 of Attachment 14. In order to adopt a modified alternative under CEQA, some minor changes were also

made to the EIR, which are reflected in the Errata sheet at Exhibit 3 of Attachments 8, 11, and 14. No additional analysis or re-circulation of the EIR is required, however, because this alternative is not considerably different from the three alternatives originally analyzed in the Draft EIR and would not, as compared to one or more of the original EIR Alternatives, clearly lessen the significant impacts of the Project (Option 1). The LAFCO resolution also needed to be modified to reflect a modified Sphere of Influence for Option 3 (Attachment 16).

After the continued public hearing on January 3, 2012, the City Council can select one of the three options above and its associated resolutions for consideration of adoption of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and Final EIR. However, if the City Council wishes to consider other options, such as Option 4 below, no final action can be taken at the January 3, 2012, meeting because of the need to do additional environmental review and due process concerns.

Option 4 (Removal of White Gate/Robinson Estates Area)

On November 7, 2011, the City Council, per a 4-3 vote, directed staff to provide information regarding a modified Option 2 (now known as Option 4) with the removal of the White Gate/Robinson Estates area, generally south of Black Rascal Creek, east of McKee, and north of Stretch Road, from the proposed SUDP/SOI per the request of several property owners. This area, which covers approximately 600 acres, is outside the City Limits but within the adopted 1997 Sphere of Influence (SOI), and removal of this area was not considered in the General Plan EIR.

City staff asked the City's General Plan and EIR consultant, Quad-Knopf, to provide information on what modifications to the EIR would be required in order to consider Option 4 and to prepare a cost estimate for that work. Since the subject area is within the current SOI and therefore was included in the baseline assumptions used in the General Plan and EIR, removal of this area would trigger revisions to the EIR Project Description and additional analysis of the population and land use projections, which would affect the Air Quality, Agriculture, Hydrology, Water Quality, Noise, and Traffic sections of the EIR. The EIR would need to be redrafted and recirculated, causing substantial delay (at least 6-12 months). The EIR technical studies could require updating as well as many sections of the EIR, and recent changes in State regulations (air quality, climate change, etc.) may require further revisions. The EIR public comment period would have to be re-opened during recirculation and the consultants would need to prepare responses to all comments received.

The consultants estimate that this entire process could take 6-12 months and could cost from \$75,000 to \$125,000. A detailed contract revision would need to be prepared and approved by City Council at a later date.

Option 4 would also trigger new public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council, including notification to all affected property owners within the 600 acres, in order to insure due process. Once the revised EIR was completed, this would take an additional 3-4 months. Other projects which rely on a new General Plan or that require staff time now devoted to the General Plan, such as the updates/revisions to the development impact fees in the Public Facilities Financing Plan, the Climate Action Plan, the Form-Based Codes, would also be delayed.

One potential concern with Option 4 is that some of the area is currently served with City water service. (The City currently serves some areas outside of the City limits with City water because they were existing water customers when the City took over the private water company in May 1973.) Approximately 40 homes along Arden Lane, Bluegrass Lane, Greenfield Drive, and Clover Lane are currently served with City water service (Exhibit 1 of Attachment 7N). Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) staff have indicated that it would be contrary to LAFCO policies and the intent of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act (the State law that governs annexations and Spheres of Influences) to remove any areas from the City's Sphere of Influence (which LAFCO must adopt) that are currently served with City sewer or water—see letter from Executive Director Bill Nicholson at Attachment 7N.

One possible alternative to moving forward with Option 4 would be to proceed with adoption of the General Plan in accordance with Option 1, 2, or 3, and then direct staff to prepare a General Plan Amendment to consider removal of that area from the SUDP/SOI. This amendment would have to have its own environmental review (paid for by the City since there is no applicant as with most General Plan Amendments) and public hearing process. Staff would need to prepare a cost estimate and schedule for such an option at a later date, but would likely be less expensive than the above Option and take approximately 6 months. It should be noted that the City's application to LAFCO to modify its Sphere of Influence would most likely need to be delayed until after the general plan amendment process was completed in order to present LAFCO with the final proposed boundary. This would cause delays with bringing the University Community and other areas into the City's Sphere of Influence, which is necessary for future annexation.

Summary Table of Options

Option	SUDP/SOI	Area of Interest (AOI)	Adoption Process
<i>Merced Vision 2015 General Plan</i>	20,700 acres (SUDP) & 37,300 acres (SOI)	None	Adopted in 1997
Option 1 (Planning Commission Recommendation) (Map at Attachment 2A)	33,576 acres (Combined SUDP/SOI)	10,000 acres	Rescind approval of EIR for Option 2 (Attachment 11) and Adopt 3 Resolutions at Attachments 8, 9, and 10
Option 2 (Removal of Castle Farms & Mission Lakes) (Attachment 2B)	28,576 acres (Combined SUDP/SOI)	15,000 acres	Adopt 2 Resolutions at Attachments 12 & 13. (EIR Resolution already adopted on Oct. 17—Attachment 11)
Option 3 (Removal of Mission Lakes Only) (Attachment 2C)	31,076 acres (Combined SUDP/SOI)	12,500 acres	Rescind approval of EIR for Option 2 and Adopt 3 Resolutions at Attachments 14, 15, and 16.
Option 4 (Option 2 plus Removal of White Gate/Robinson Estates) (Attachment 2D)	27,976 acres (Combined SUDP/SOI)	15,600 acres	Modification of the EIR, Recirculation of the EIR, & Additional Public Hearings (No Final Action Possible Tonight)
Other Possible Options (City Council would need to provide specific direction about areas to delete/add, etc.)	??	??	Modification of the EIR, Recirculation of the EIR, & Additional Public Hearings (No Final Action Possible Tonight)

Adopting the Land Use Diagram and Avoiding Conflicts of Interest

In order to avoid potential or perceived conflicts of interest regarding properties owned by the Planning Commissioners and City Council members, the City Attorney has advised that the General Plan Land Use Diagram should be adopted in segments. Although no changes in land use designation are proposed within the current City limits where these properties are located, this approach reflects an abundance of caution to avoid even perceived conflicts of interest.

For the City Council, staff divided the Land Use Diagram into nine (9) sectors as shown in Attachment 1A for Option 1. For Option 2, there are only 7 sectors (with

Castle Farms and Mission Lakes removed); and for Option 3, there are only 8 sectors with Mission Lakes removed (see Attachments 1B and 1C). These sectors have been drawn so that no more than one member should have to declare a potential conflict for any one sector. In the case of Sectors VIII and IX, Castle Farms and Mission Lakes respectively, no Council Members have property interests in those areas.

The nine sectors are described as follows and the Council Member with property interests in that area is also noted:

- 1) Sector I – South of Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Tracks and Highway 140, East of Martin Luther King Jr. Way/South Highway 59 [*Council Member Rawling*]
- 2) Sector II – South of Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Tracks between V Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way and South of Lopes Avenue, West of Martin Luther King Jr. Way (except for Sector IX) [*Council Member Blake*]
- 3) Sector III – North of Lopes Avenue, West of V Street, South of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Tracks; and West of North Highway 59 from Olive to Buena Vista Drive;, and East of Sarasota Avenue from Buena Vista to El Redondo Drive; and North and West of El Redondo Drive until Yosemite Avenue; and West of El Redondo Drive, North of Yosemite Avenue (except for Sector VIII) [*Council Member Pedrozo*]
- 4) Sector IV – North of Buena Vista Drive between Sarasota Avenue/El Redondo Drive and R Street, and North of Cardella Road between El Redondo Drive and Gardner/Golf Road [*Mayor Pro Tempore Lor*]
- 5) Sector V – North of Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Tracks, South of Olive Avenue between North Highway 59 and G Street; and North of Olive Avenue, South of Buena Vista Drive between North Highway 59 and R Street; and North of Olive Avenue, South of Loughborough Drive between R Street and Collins Drive; and North of North Bear Creek Drive, South of East Olive Avenue between G Street and Parsons Avenue [*Council Member Dossetti*]
- 6) Sector VI – North of Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Tracks, South of North Bear Creek Drive, East of G Street; and North of North Bear Creek Drive, South of Olive Avenue, East of Parsons; and North of Olive Avenue, East of Collins Drive; and North of Loughborough Drive, South of Yosemite Avenue, East of R Street [*Mayor Thurston*]
- 7) Sector VII – North of Yosemite Avenue, South of Cardella Road between R Street and Gardner/Golf Road; and North of Yosemite Avenue, East of Gardner/Golf Road [*Council Member Murphy*]
- 8) Sector VIII — Castle Farms [*No conflicts*] [Options 1 & 3 only]
- 9) Sector IX — Mission Lakes [*No conflicts*] [Option 1 only]

City Council Options

After the continued public hearing on January 3, the City Council can select either Option 1, 2, or 3 for adoption of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and take final action. However, if the City Council wishes to explore Option 4 or any other options, the City Council will need to direct staff to prepare final information about costs, environmental review, and public hearing process for consideration at a future date.

To adopt the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and Final EIR for Options 1, 2, or 3, two or three resolutions will need to be adopted—1 for certification of the Final EIR (already adopted for Option 2), 1 for approval of the General Plan document and Land Use Diagram (9 separate votes will need to be taken on the Land Use Diagram as outlined above if Option 1 is chosen, 7 separate votes with Option 2, and 8 separate votes with Option 3), and 1 for the application to LAFCO for a modified Sphere of Influence. However, if the City Council wishes to adopt either Option 1 or 3, the previously-adopted EIR Resolution #2011-63 for Option 2 (Attachment 11) would need to first be rescinded before proceeding with adopting the other resolutions for the preferred Option. The City Council should select the resolutions that accompany whichever Option they prefer as follows:

1. Option 1 (Original Draft General Plan), as recommended by the Planning Commission, including Resolutions at Attachments 8, 9, and 10; or,
2. Option 2 (EIR Alternative #2, removing both Castle Farms and Mission Lakes), including Resolutions at Attachments 11 (already adopted), 12, and 13; or,
3. Option 3 (Modified EIR Alternative #2A, removing Mission Lakes only), including Resolutions at Attachments 14, 15, and 16.

Respectfully Submitted,

Reviewed and Approved,

Kim Espinosa,
Planning Manager

David B. Gonzalves, Director of
Development Services

Approved By,

John M. Bramble,
City Manager

[KE: 2011/General Plan Update/Public Hearings/04-CC Adoption/Gen Plan Adoption AR-CC Hrg4-Jan3-12.docx]

PLEASE BRING YOUR COPY OF THE DRAFT *MERCED VISION 2030 GENERAL PLAN* AND DRAFT AND FINAL EIR's TO THE MEETING.

Attachments:

- 1) Land Use Diagram Divided Into Sectors for Adoption (Options 1, 2, & 3)
- 2) Maps Comparing Options with Current General Plan (Options 1, 2, 3, & 4)
- 3) Past City Council Administrative Reports on the General Plan
 - a) September 19, 2011, City Council Meeting (without Attachments)
 - b) October 17, 2011, City Council Meeting (without Attachments)
 - c) November 7, 2011, City Council Meeting (without Attachments)
- 4) Planning Commission Resolution #2988 (EIR) & Planning Commission Resolution #2989 (General Plan)
- 5) Planning Commission Minutes (July 20, 2011)
- 6) Planning Commission Staff Report #11-09
- 7) Correspondence Regarding the General Plan Received at or after the Planning Commission Public Hearing
 - a) Email from Jim Sanders (July 20, 2011)
 - b) "What Does the Future Look Like" by Jean Okuye (July 20, 2011)
 - c) "Paving Paradise" Study Submitted by Jean Okuye (July 20, 2011)
 - d) "Minor Subdivisions of Agricultural Land in Merced County (1998-2008)" Submitted by Jean Okuye (July 20, 2011 & Sept. 19, 2011)
 - e) Letter from Jim Todd of Merced Gateways (July 20, 2011)
 - f) Email from Steve Rough of Yosemite Church (July 22, 2011)
 - g) Letter from Paul Fillebrown of Merced County (August 5, 2011)
 - h) Letter from Tom Lollini of UC Merced (August 16, 2011)
 - i) Letter from John Wilbanks of Castle Farms (August 30, 2011)
 - j) Letter from Sharon Dicker of LWH Farms (September 19, 2011)
 - k) Letter from Vince Kovacevich of Castle Farms (September 14, 2011)
 - l) Letter from Economic Development Advisory Committee (Oct. 4, 2011)
 - m) Letter from Bob Carpenter (October 11, 2011)
 - n) Letter from Bill Nicholson of LAFCO (December 15, 2011)
 - o) Letter from UC Merced (December 15, 2011)
- 8) Draft City Council Resolution (EIR) for Option 1
 - a) Exhibit 1—Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Option 1)
 - b) Exhibit 2—Mitigation Monitoring Program (same for all Options)
 - c) Exhibit 3—Final EIR Errata Sheet (same for all Options)
- 9) Draft City Council Resolution (General Plan) for Option 1
 - a) Exhibit A—General Plan Public Review Draft (August 2010)
 - b) Exhibit B—Proposed Changes to General Plan (Option 1)
 - c) Exhibit C—Proposed Changes to Land Use Diagram (Option 1)
 - d) Exhibit D—Land Use Diagram Sectors (Option 1)

- 10) Draft City Council Resolution (Application to LAFCO) for Option 1
 - a) Exhibit A—Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP)/Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary map (Option 1)
- 11) Adopted City Council Resolution #2011-63 (EIR) for Option 2
 - a) Exhibit 1—Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Option 2)
 - b) Exhibit 2—Mitigation Monitoring Program (same as Attachment 8B)
 - c) Exhibit 3—Final EIR Errata Sheet (Same as Attachment 8C)
- 12) Draft City Council Resolution (General Plan) for Option 2
 - a) Exhibit A—General Plan Public Review Draft (August 2010)
 - b) Exhibit B—Proposed Changes to General Plan (Option 2)
 - c) Exhibit C—Proposed Changes to Land Use Diagram (Option 2)
 - d) Exhibit D—Land Use Diagram Sectors (Option 2)
- 13) Draft City Council Resolution (Application to LAFCO) for Option 2
 - a) Exhibit A—Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP)/Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary map (Option 2)
- 14) Draft City Council Resolution (EIR) for Option 3
 - a) Exhibit 1—Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Option 3)
 - b) Exhibit 2—Mitigation Monitoring Program (same as Attachments 8B & 11 B)
 - c) Exhibit 3—Final EIR Errata Sheet (same as Attachments 8C & 11C)
- 15) Draft City Council Resolution (General Plan) for Option 3
 - a) Exhibit A—General Plan Public Review Draft (August 2010)
 - b) Exhibit B—Proposed Changes to General Plan (Option 3)
 - c) Exhibit C—Proposed Changes to Land Use Diagram (Option 3)
 - d) Exhibit D—Land Use Diagram Sectors (Option 3)
- 16) Draft City Council Resolution (Application to LAFCO) for Option 3
 - a) Exhibit A—Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP)/Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary map (Option 3)