



Agenda Item: \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

**TO:** John M. Bramble, City Manager

**FROM:** Kim Espinosa, Planning Manager

**DATE:** September 9, 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 public hearing, the City Council should give direction to staff regarding any possible changes in the General Plan and then continue the public hearing to the October 3, 2011, City Council meeting to consider adoption of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and its associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

*City Council:* After the staff presentation, open the public hearing, and receive public testimony. The City Council should then give direction to staff regarding any desired changes in the General Plan (changes in the proposed Specific Urban Development Plan/Sphere of Influence boundary, policy language changes, etc.) and then continue the public hearing to the City Council meeting of October 3, 2011, for final action on the adoption of the General Plan and EIR.

### **POSSIBLE CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS**

1. Continue the public hearing to October 3, 2011; or,
2. Refer back to staff for reconsideration of specific items as requested by Council; or,
3. 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:**

### Project Description

The *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* is a comprehensive update of the City's General Plan and will replace the *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan* adopted in 1997. The General Plan includes revised Land Use, Transportation & Circulation, Open Space/Conservation, Noise, and Safety Elements as well as optional elements—Urban Expansion, Public Services & Facilities, Urban Design, and Sustainable Development. (The Housing Element was adopted under a separate process in May 2011.)

The expansion of the City's growth boundary will define the limits for extending City services and infrastructure so as to accommodate new development anticipated within the 20 year time-frame of the General Plan. The current growth boundary or Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP) contains approximately 20,000 acres and the current Sphere of Influence (SOI) contains approximately 33,700 acres. The proposed SUDP/SOI (now combined into one) contains 33,576 acres. Despite the size of the SUDP/SOI, policies are proposed in the Plan to promote compact urban development and provide for an orderly transition from rural to urban land uses. After extensive public review over the last six years, the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* is now ready for adoption after the Environmental Impact Report is certified.

### Brief Overview of the General Plan Update Process

*The following is a brief overview of the General Plan Update process. For a more detailed history of the project, please refer to Attachment B of Planning Commission Staff Report #11-09 (Attachment 7).*

The General Plan Update process first began in 2005 and was originally supposed to simply add the UC Merced Campus, the University Community, and areas in between to the City's growth boundary. During 2006, much of the work was focused on defining the General Plan Update Study Area, which grew to include areas of expansion to the northwest, southwest, and southeast in addition to the UC Merced-related areas. In July 2006, after reviewing various options for a Draft SUDP/SOI boundary and several public meetings, the City Council adopted a Draft SUDP/SOI of approximately 43,591 acres or over double the size of the City's current SUDP (20,540 acres). In August 2006, a new firm, Quad-Knopf of Roseville, was hired to complete the General Plan Update and EIR after the original consultant contract was terminated.

Because of the size and population capacity of the General Plan Study Area, it became necessary to define a smaller boundary to accommodate the next 20 years of growth. Currently the City's Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP)

boundary and the Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary are different boundaries with the SUDP reflecting a 20-year growth plan and the Sphere of Influence defining a longer time frame. However, since the City's SOI boundary was adopted by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in 1997, new criteria has been put in place by LAFCO that will require the City to demonstrate how we can provide services to all areas within the SOI. Because of those criteria, staff and the consultants recommended that the SUDP and SOI boundaries be co-terminus and that a larger Area of Interest (AOI) be defined that represents long-term growth areas. Areas within the SUDP/SOI will have City land use designations, but areas within the AOI will not. However, there are criteria included in the Draft General Plan defining how areas within the AOI can be added to the SUDP/SOI as time goes on. Further environmental studies will also be required before any of these AOI areas could be developed.

In September 2007, a Draft Land Use Diagram with a Draft SUDP/SOI was released for public review. After input from the community and property owners, the Draft Land Use Diagram was modified in February 2008 and included a 33,463-acre SUDP/SOI within the larger 43,591-acre Area of Interest, which corresponded to the original Draft SUDP/SOI. The combined SUDP/SOI is almost the same size (33,463 acres) as the current SOI (37,300 acres), but includes some different areas and the large area northeast of Lake Yosemite, the former planned site of the UC Merced Campus, has been removed.

During 2008 to 2010, the consultants worked with City staff to complete the Draft *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* document (including all the goals, policies, and implementing actions) and the Draft EIR, both released for public review on August 24, 2010. The Draft *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* is based on the *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan* and contains many of the same goals, policies, and implementing actions. The Draft General Plan has been updated to include new information since the 1997 adoption, new policies to address the proposed SUDP/SOI and Area of Interest, and new policies to address new issue areas (such as the High Speed Rail, the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint process, climate change, etc.) which have arisen since the 1997 adoption of the *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan*. Many public meetings were held throughout the General Plan Update process. (For details, see Finding D of the Planning Commission Staff Report at Attachment 7.)

### What is the General Plan and Why Is It Important?

According to State law, each city and county in California is required to adopt a General Plan which provides for "the physical development of the County or City, and any land outside its boundaries, which bears relation to its planning." The General Plan must consist of seven required elements—land use, circulation, open space, conservation, housing, noise, and safety—all of which must contain specific

content, also prescribed by the State, and which shall be consistent with one another. (For example, the land use element can't designate a property as residential if the open space element indicates that it should be preserved as open space.) The General Plan may also consist of as many optional elements as the community wants.

Most people associate the General Plan with the Land Use Diagram, which shows the various land uses (residential, commercial, industrial, schools, open space, etc.) for specific pieces of property within the community's growth boundary. The Land Use Diagram is important, but the General Plan is primarily a policy document which spells out the community's vision for growth and development. All new development within the community must conform with the General Plan, including its diagrams, maps, and policies. In fact, the City Council cannot approve a development project which does not conform to its General Plan. The General Plan must be amended, through a public hearing process, before such a project could be approved. An example would be that a shopping center could not be built on a vacant parcel that is designated on the General Plan for single-family residential unless the General Plan is amended and the shopping center conforms to all the policies in the General Plan. When applications for development are presented to the Planning Commission and City Council, staff provides an analysis of the project's conformity to the General Plan. City infrastructure plans, impact fee programs, and other master plans also need to conform to the General Plan.

The *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan* is the City's current General Plan, which was adopted in 1997. The *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan* contains a 20,540-acre Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP) boundary, a 37,300-acre Sphere of Influence (SOI), and the seven state-required elements, along with additional elements covering urban expansion, public facilities, urban design, and sustainable development. Once adopted, all policies in the General Plan, no matter which element they are in, should be treated with equal importance and must be implemented.

#### Major Changes from the *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan*

The Draft *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* is based on the current *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan*, adopted in 1997. Most of the Vision 2015 Plan is still relevant today so the vast majority of the goals, policies, and implementing actions from the 2015 Plan are maintained in the 2030 Plan. Factual information in the General Plan text has been updated to reflect current conditions and other text has been added or modified to reflect changes in the 2030 Plan.

The following is a brief summary of major policies that have been added in each Element of the General Plan from the 2015 Plan to the 2030 Plan.

- 1) Urban Expansion—A co-terminus SUDP/SOI has been proposed along with an Area of Interest (AOI) representing over 40 years of growth.
- 2) Land Use—Increased flexibility has been added for retail at major intersections under unique circumstances; development standards have been added for large research parks and freeway-oriented developments; the South Merced Community Plan (adopted in 2008) has been incorporated; a transit-oriented development overlay has been proposed in the vicinity of the Downtown High Speed Rail station; large Community Plan areas have been added (University Community, Castle Farms, Mission Lakes, Bellevue Corridor, etc.), and implementation of the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint principles and densities has been added.
- 3) Transportation & Circulation—Policies have been added regarding “Complete Streets” that accommodate all modes of travel; the Merced-Atwater Expressway and Campus Parkway have been added to the Circulation system; and the Bicycle Advisory Commission is discussed.
- 4) Public Services & Facilities—Policies relating to schools have been substantially modified to better define City/School relations and a new goal area regarding telecommunications was added.
- 5) Urban Design—No major changes.
- 6) Open Space, Conservation, & Recreation—Policies from the 2004 Parks and Open Space Master Plan were added as well as more information about wetlands and wildlife resources.
- 7) Sustainable Development—Policies were added relating to Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, including the completion of a Climate Action Plan and implementing “green” building codes, and a policy was added relating to “healthy communities.”
- 8) Housing—Adopted by a separate process in May 2011.
- 9) Noise—New noise measurement techniques were added and noise data was updated.
- 10) Safety—Information regarding Fire Department practices was updated along with emergency preparedness procedures and policies regarding the 200-Year Floodplain in addition to the 100-Year Floodplain were added.

#### Proposed Changes to the General Plan Since the August 2010 Draft

Since August 2010, the City has received numerous comments on the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*, both verbal and written, from members of the general public, other public agencies, City staff, City boards or commissions, etc. Staff has kept a record of these comments and, as much as possible, changes have been incorporated into the document in response to these comments. Other changes were required to respond to comments on the Draft EIR. These changes are outlined at Attachment 3 along with the source of the comments.

Most of the proposed changes are relatively minor word changes, clarifications, typographical errors, or updating factual information. The major changes are mostly in Chapter 3 (Land Use), Chapter 4 (Transportation and Circulation), Chapter 5 (Public Services and Facilities), and Chapter 11 (Safety). The Chapter 3 (Land Use) changes are related to various Community Plans, especially changes asked for by UC Merced relating to the new boundary for the campus and University Community North, which also affects the Land Use Diagram. The Chapter 4 (Transportation & Circulation) changes include many recommended by the Bicycle Advisory Commission and some changes related to Castle Airport (some changes to Chapter 11 were also related to Castle Airport). The changes in Chapter 5 (Public Services and Facilities) and Chapter 11 (Safety) are mostly from Fire Chief Mike McLaughlin, appointed in 2011, in order to better reflect policies and procedures of the Merced Fire Department under his new leadership. (Retired Fire Chief Ken Mitten had served on the General Plan Technical Advisory Committee and had previously provided his input on the General Plan.)

Changes will need to be made to the proposed Land Use Diagram as well. Since the Diagram was substantially completed in February 2008 (with only minor modifications in August 2010), there have been ten general plan amendments approved through the normal City public hearing process which will need to be reflected on the proposed map. These proposed changes are outlined at Attachment 2. For information on how the Land Use Diagram affects specific properties within the City's SUDP/SOI, please see Findings I, J, K, and L of the Planning Commission Staff Report at Attachment 7.

#### 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 Planning Commission, staff divided the Land Use Diagram into five sectors as shown in Attachment A of the Planning Commission Staff Report at Attachment 7 for the purposes of adoption, based on the locations of the primary residences of the members and other property interests that were provided to the City by the individual members. For the City Council, staff divided the Land Use Diagram into seven (7) sectors as shown in Attachment 1. These sectors have been drawn so that no more than one member should have to declare a potential conflict for any one sector.

The seven sectors are described as follows (see also Attachment 1) and the Councilmember with property interests in that area is also noted:

- 1) Sector I – South of Highway 99 and Highway 140, East of R Street (south of Childs Ave) and Q Street (north of Childs Ave) [*Councilmember Rawlings*]
- 2) Sector II – North of Highway 99 and Highway 140, East of Q Street, and South of North Bear Creek Drive from Q Street to Oleander Drive, South of Alexander Avenue from Oleander to McKee Road, and South of East Olive Avenue, East of McKee [*Mayor Spriggs*]
- 3) Sector III – East of G Street and North of North Bear Creek Drive from G Street to Oleander Drive, North of Alexander Avenue from Oleander to McKee, and North of East Olive Avenue, East of McKee [*Councilmember Carlisle*]
- 4) Sector IV – North of Highway 99 between T Street and Q Street, North of North Bear Creek Drive from R Street to G Street, and North of Loughborough Drive from M Street to G Street [*Councilmember Gabriault-Acosta*]
- 5) Sector V – South of Santa Fe Road/West Olive Avenue and West of R Street from Olive to North Bear Creek Drive, West of T Street from North Bear Creek Drive to Highway 99, and South of Highway 99, West of Q Street (from Highway 99 to Childs) and West of South Highway 59, South of Childs [*Mayor Pro Tempore Blake*]
- 6) Sector VI – North of Santa Fe Road/West Olive Avenue from North Highway 59 to R Street, East of North Highway 59 from Olive to Buena Vista Drive, East of Sarasota Avenue from Buena Vista to El Redondo Drive, and East of San Augustine Ave, North of El Redondo [*Councilmember Lor*]
- 7) Sector VII – North of Santa Fe Road/West Olive Avenue, West of North Highway 59 from Olive to Buena Vista Drive, West of Sarasota Avenue from Buena Vista to El Redondo Drive, and West of San Augustine Ave, North of El Redondo [*Councilmember Pedrozo*]

### Environmental Impact Report

#### Preparation of the Environmental Impact Report

The Draft and Final Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* (SCH#2008071069) were prepared by Quad-Knopf to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Specialized sub-consultants serving with Quad-Knopf in the environmental assessment process included Fehr & Peers (traffic), J.C. Brennan & Associates (noise), Peak and Associates (cultural resources), and Geocon (geology). The contract with Quad-Knopf was amended twice to include an expanded scope to ensure that the analysis was as complete and accurate as possible. The table in Finding O of the Planning

Commission Staff Report at Attachment 7 provides a summary of key events and dates leading up to the Final EIR.

### Impacts Identified from the Project

The Draft EIR for the proposed *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* has identified potentially significant physical environmental impacts that are expected to result from the Project. The EIR also provides appropriate measures to mitigate the impacts and to reduce anticipated *physical* environmental impacts to less than significant levels. Significant Environmental Effects Requiring Mitigation include impacts on aesthetics, agriculture & forest resources, air quality, biological resources, noise, transportation/traffic, and greenhouse gas emissions (global climate change). These impacts and mitigation measures are summarized in the table in Finding P of the Planning Commission Staff Report at Attachment 7 and in more detail in Table ES-2 in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR (modified in the Final EIR, see Section 4) as well as in the Mitigation Monitoring Program in Section 5 of the Final EIR and at Exhibit 2 of Attachment 9.

The EIR for the proposed *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* also identified Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects (summarized in Section 5.1, starting on page 5-1 of the Draft EIR). These impacts cannot be mitigated below the relevant threshold of significance. These impacts, which will require a Statement of Overriding Considerations, include aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation/traffic, and greenhouse gas emissions (global climate change).

Significant Cumulative Environmental Effects resulting from the General Plan implementation are described in Section 5.7 of the Draft EIR. Significant and unavoidable impacts, which will require a Statement of Overriding Considerations, were found in the area of agricultural and forest resources, air quality, hydrology and water quality, public services (electric and gas), transportation/traffic, and greenhouse gas emissions (global climate change).

### Project Alternatives

Three project alternatives were analyzed in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR. CEQA requires a discussion of alternatives which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impact of the project. Table 4-1 on page 4-18 of the Draft EIR provides a comparison of the alternatives vs. the project with mitigations for 17 different impact areas (i.e. air quality, noise, traffic, etc.).

- Alternative 1—Existing General Plan (No Project) assumed that the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* was not adopted and the *Merced Vision 2015 General Plan* remained in effect, which would leave the SUDP at approximately 21,700 acres. According to Table 4-1, Alternative 1 would

result in the reduction of 10 impacts, the increase of 3 impacts, and 4 impacts would remain unchanged. Alternative 1 was found to be environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan and other alternatives because it fails to achieve the project objectives (see Section D of Exhibit 1 of Attachment 9).

- Alternative 2—Reduced Project Area assumed a smaller growth boundary and slower growth by eliminating two large Community Plan areas (Castle Farms and Mission Lakes, totaling approximately 5,000 acres) and reducing the proposed SUDP/SOI from 33,576 acres to 28,576 acres. Alternative 2 would result in a reduction in 11 impacts, no impacts would be increased, and 6 impacts would remain unchanged. Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative because it reduces more potential impacts than other alternatives and serves to reduce the severity of three significant cumulative impacts (agriculture, air quality, and traffic). However, the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations at Exhibit 1 of Attachment 9 finds that Alternative 2 is less desirable than the General Plan (“the Project”) because mitigation measures incorporated into the Project will substantially lessen or avoid most of the environmental impacts of the Project, thereby diminishing or preventing the perceived impact avoiding benefits of adopting Alternative 2, and that Alternative 2 would not accomplish all of the Project objectives.
- Alternative 3—Concentrated Growth assumed that the proposed SUDP/SOI boundary and the number of residential units would remain the same, but residential densities would be increased significantly in and around existing developed areas to provide the same growth capacity. More land would be designated for Open Space or Reserve. Alternative 3 would result in a reduction in 8 impacts, no impacts would increase, and 9 impacts would remain unchanged. In Exhibit 1 of Attachment 9, Alternative 3 is found to be less desirable than the Project for the same reasons as Alternative 2.

In the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations at Exhibit 1 of Attachment 9, it is concluded that the proposed *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* is the superior alternative for achieving the goals established for the Project and the City of Merced while minimizing impacts to the environment. Each of the alternatives are not superior to the Project because they compromise one or more of the Project objectives, and for all those reasons above, all three alternatives are rejected in favor of the Project.

#### Final EIR and Response to Comments

The Draft EIR for the proposed *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* was distributed to interested agencies and the public for a 60-day-period (beginning on August 24, 2010 and ending on October 22, 2010). The City received 26 letters commenting on the DEIR. One of those letters arrived after the close of the comment period,

but it has been responded to as well. Those letters can be seen in their entirety in Section 3 of the Final EIR (distributed to the City Council on July 8, 2011). Responses to comments contained in those letters are located immediately following each letter in Section 3 of the Final EIR.

As required per Section 21092.5(a) of the State of California Public Resources Code, a copy of the response to comments was sent to each public agency who had submitted a letter on July 8, 2011 (at least 10 days prior to the Planning Commission hearing). A notice was also sent to all those individuals who had commented on the DEIR regarding the availability of the Final EIR, including the Responses to Comments, on July 8, 2011. (The DEIR commenters were also mailed public hearing notices for the July 20 Planning Commission hearing on June 28, 2011, which indicated that the Final EIR would be available on July 8, 2011.) The Final EIR was made available for public review at City offices, the Main Branch of the Merced County Library, and the City's website on July 8, 2011. (The Final EIR was actually on the City's website by the afternoon of July 7, 2011.) Printed copies and copies on CD-ROM were also made available. These same individuals and agencies were informed of the City Council public hearing by mail on August 24, 2011.

The Final EIR for the proposed *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* also contains minor modifications to the text and mitigation measures in response to the comments received (see Section Four of the Final EIR). Section Five of the Final EIR includes a revised table of proposed mitigation measures, which serves as the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and is excerpted at Exhibit 2 of Attachment 9 of this report. One error was noted after publication of the Final EIR—page 2-2 should be corrected to read “Letter 22—Thomas C. Grave” (not “Thomas Lollini” as noted).

### Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* identified significant impacts associated with the Project. Approval of a Project with significant impacts requires that findings be made by the City pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State CEQA Guidelines. These findings must state that significant impacts of the Project would either: 1) be mitigated to a less-than-significant level pursuant to the mitigation measures identified in this EIR; or 2) mitigation measures notwithstanding, have a residual significant impact that requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Quad-Knopf in consultation with City staff has prepared Draft "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations" (Exhibit 1 of Attachment 9). The findings are divided into six sections: 1) Introduction; 2) Findings Associated with Certification of the EIR; 3) Findings Associated with Specific Impacts and

Mitigation Measures; 4) Findings Associated with Significant Cumulative Environmental Effects; 5) Findings Supporting Rejection of Alternatives; and 6) a Draft Statement of Overriding Considerations.

All significant impacts associated with the Project have been mitigated to a level of insignificance except those described above. Therefore, a Draft Statement of Overriding Considerations (beginning on page 38 of Exhibit 1 of Attachment 9) has been prepared.

#### Mitigation Monitoring

In accordance with CEQA requirements, the City is required to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program when approving mitigation measures contained in an EIR or mitigated negative declaration. The Program is to be designed to ensure compliance with the adopted project mitigation measures that were required by the public agency in order to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects. A Mitigation Monitoring Program is required for this project and can be found in Section 5 of the Final EIR and at Exhibit 2 of Attachment 9.

#### Planning Commission Recommendation

On July 20, 2011, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider adoption of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and certification of its associated EIR. Ten (10) individuals offered public testimony. After considering all the testimony, by unanimous vote (5-0-2, 5 ayes, 2 absent), the Planning Commission recommended certification of the Final General Plan EIR (including adoption of Findings of Fact, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring Program) and adoption of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* (as shown in the August 2010 Draft) with changes to the text of the document as outlined in Attachment 3. For the Land Use Diagram, the Planning Commission took five separate votes for the five sectors, and all votes were unanimous (4-0-1-2, 4 ayes, 1 abstain, 2 absent). Please see the Planning Commission Minutes and Resolutions at Attachments 4, 5, and 6 for details.

Letters received at or after the Planning Commission hearing can be seen at Attachment 8. (Earlier correspondence is included in Attachment E of the Planning Commission staff report at Attachment 7). Based on the letter from Steve Rough (Attachment 8F), staff is recommending one minor change to the General Plan document regarding the right-of-way on Yosemite Avenue, east of Parson/Gardner, which is reflected in Attachment 3, Items #43 and #60.

#### City Council Action

Staff is recommending that the City Council open the public hearing and receive public testimony. The City Council should then give staff any direction regarding

possible changes in the General Plan (changes in the proposed SUDP/SOI, policy language changes, etc.), and then continue the public hearing to the City Council meeting of October 3, 2011 for final consideration of adoption of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* and certification of the Final EIR.

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 Hearing-Sept19-11.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 Purposes
- 2) Proposed Changes to General Plan Land Use Diagram
- 3) Proposed Changes to the General Plan Since the August 2010 Public Review Draft
- 4) Planning Commission Resolution #2988 (EIR)
- 5) Planning Commission Resolution #2989 (General Plan)
- 6) Planning Commission Minutes (July 20, 2011)
- 7) Planning Commission Staff Report #11-09
- 8) 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" Presentation 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)
  - 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)
- 9) Draft City Council Resolution (EIR) (For reference only)
  - a) Exhibit 1—Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations
  - b) Exhibit 2—Mitigation Monitoring Program
- 10) Draft City Council Resolution (General Plan) (For reference only)
  - a) Exhibit A—General Plan Public Review Draft (August 2010)
  - b) Exhibit B—Proposed Changes to General Plan (same as Attachment 3)
  - c) Exhibit C—Proposed Changes to Land Use Diagram (same as Attachment 2)
  - d) Exhibit D—Land Use Diagram Sectors (same as Attachment 1)
- 11) Draft City Council Resolution (Application to LAFCO) (For reference only)
  - a) Exhibit A—Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP)/Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary map