



General Plan Update Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

June 2, 2009

Summary

Yuba County staff, along with consultants EDAW, Fehr & Peers, and Economics and Planning Systems, conducted the seventh Yuba County General Plan Update Advisory Committee Meeting (GPUAC) on Tuesday, June 2, 2009, starting at 4:00 p.m. in the County Government Center in Marysville.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss:

- ✓ Alternatives process to date
- ✓ Alternatives 1-5 and preferences
- ✓ Alternatives A and B
- ✓ Transportation analysis
- ✓ Economic and fiscal analysis
- ✓ Options for refining the alternatives
- ✓ Next steps in the alternatives and General Plan process

The input from the General Plan Update Advisory Committee is summarized below.

Committee Input

- ✓ April 1st Beale approved a 334-acre development with private lease of air force base (AFB) land.
- ✓ This development includes wastewater treatment plant upgrades and could include a regional wastewater treatment plant (WWTP).
- ✓ The project would accommodate rail spur use of the railroad (RR) and aggregate could be transported by RR through the base instead of around the base.
- ✓ The project includes an industrial park.
- ✓ The project envisions a California Innovation Center (CIC)- which could include a think tank on technology on agriculture



GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Summary, June 2, 2009

- ✓ The CIC could include research and business operations involving cyber command; hotel; environmental sustainability; renewable energy, such as solar fields; biomass; air force base related industries, a university, and other private sector operations.
- ✓ The land will have a 50-year land lease and will have more access than other areas of Beale, the WWTP to be independent of AFB control.
- ✓ Asking about projects such as Marysville Bypass – were they in the transportation modeling? Answer: Yes, planned and programmed projects are considered in the modeling; County is not anticipating connecting Yuba River Parkway to 70 north of Marysville.
- ✓ Comment that A and B and Wheatland growth assumptions are not realistic.
- ✓ Want to get map of planned roadway improvements.
- ✓ Question from GPUAC – did 1 become B and 2 become A?Z Answer: No. They are a combination of Alternatives 1 through 5 and input from the Board of Supervisors (BOS).
- ✓ Did the alternatives factor in Wheatland? Answer: yes, assumptions were included for Wheatland based on General Plan.
- ✓ Does Alternative A or does B comply with AB 32 or SB 375?
- ✓ Which SP areas are open for discussion? Answer: All of them, although the extent is limited by those with development agreements or which have entitlements approved.
- ✓ Asking about Wheatland plan and the impact on the GPU – there is a need to coordinate parks and recreation and other services.
- ✓ School district organization boundaries; in Alternative A, the new neighborhoods area near Highway 65 presents a challenge for school district organizations; there are 4 school districts that have influence in this area.
- ✓ Do either of these Alternatives regionalize infrastructure?
- ✓ Beale AFB – asking about whether JLUS has been taken into account?
Answer: Yes.
- ✓ Alternative A and B, as well as Wheatland GP and Johnson Rancho are unreasonably high in terms of growth assumptions.
- ✓ There is a need to cut back Alternatives A and B.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary, March 17, 2008



- ✓ Prefer to develop areas close to existing developed areas first; then gradually look to move out; need jobs, encourage job development.
- ✓ Be cooperative on taxes to favor the establishment of manufacturing or other base employment in the County.
- ✓ Shopping, eating, things to do, quality of life issues are important to job growth.
- ✓ A new casino and resort would help with retail and quality of life.
- ✓ The County, in the General Plan Update is planning for people that are not here yet; but the County needs to take into consideration the wishes of the people that are here today; these qualities were expressed in the public workshops very clearly.
- ✓ Need the job and income base here to support retail and service development.
- ✓ Not a supporter of allowing uncontrolled housing growth; not all the SPs are going to build out.
- ✓ Plumas Lake and Spring Valley push County more toward being a bedroom community with the obvious impacts on transportation and air quality; but also a quality of life impacts to the community, and the impacts of this growth on existing residents needs to be considered.
- ✓ People need jobs, job training, and affordable housing – they cannot afford housing provided in recent new growth specific plans and residential subdivisions.
- ✓ Prefer to concentrate development where infrastructure is available and affordable, this makes housing more affordable.
- ✓ Providing housing appropriate in types/costs for anticipated new jobs is important.
- ✓ Want figures of existing and planned numbers for each sub area; want the assumptions used for developing buildout estimates. Answer: We will provide these assumptions to the Advisory Committee.

Public Questions and Comments:

- ✓ ? Why did they not have the infill / revitalization the same in all the Alternatives?



GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Summary, June 2, 2009

- ✓ ? Currently, how much of the overall transportation is going out of the County to Sacramento area and Placer County area?
- ✓ ? Is a transportation management plan being considered?
- ✓ ? What if a development went in with solar; would that assist with GHG?
- ✓ Discussing greenhouse gas (GHG) cap-and-trade programs in California, a federal program, and international cap-and trade-programs and repercussions for Yuba County.
- ✓ Asking about timeline for the General Plan alternatives and preferred alternative selection process. Answer: The next GPUAC meeting is June 15th meeting. The GPU Team will conduct analysis of options for refining the alternatives based on BOS and GPUAC direction. This analysis may take 4-6 week, depending on the amount and level of detail of information necessary. The BOS will consider the alternatives and make a selection toward the end of summer.
- ✓ Talking about rural quality of life; talking about attracting baby boomers; if want to build a sustainable community, want to attract baby boomers; should look for attracting those with disposable income.
- ✓ Interested in an agricultural tourism idea in the River Highlands or Smartsville area; want to build low-scale Apple Hill; with sustainable farming vineyards; orchards.
- ✓ Water is a problem, though.
- ✓ Want to attract craftspeople; want to hire people.
- ✓ There are 50 ranchers and 250 jobs involved in Apple Hill; this project generated \$28M in revenue and \$4M in employment wages.
- ✓ Commenter is looking for zoning that allows 20 acre parcels in River Highlands area.
- ✓ Need higher density housing for low income needs.
- ✓ Believe trips are not as important as VMT; VMT per HH was better in Linda/Olivehurst area, in the central developed portion of the County; worst thing would be large amounts of development in Foothills; ideal would be to have housing close to existing and future job centers; planned in a way to reduce trip lengths.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary, March 17, 2008



- ✓ MTP has Yuba Parkway; has Wheatland bypass; will have other regional infrastructure projects in the future.
- ✓ Don't see people buying homes as commuters in the future as much; previously, people were being priced out of homes closer to employment centers; but now, housing is moving toward more local basis relative to house types and incomes, instead of regional housing stock providing jobs for those living elsewhere. The County should consider targeting an internal jobs/housing balance.
- ✓ Discussing energy efficiency; carbon sequestration; planting trees as feasible MM for GHG impacts.
- ✓ Blueprint said to build smaller, more compact development; closer to transit and jobs; commenter believes this can be accommodated in either Alternative A or B.
- ✓ Asking about how we got to Alternatives A and B from public support for Alternative 1, 2. Asking GPUAC to look at Alternative 1, which was overwhelmingly supported by the people.
- ✓ Talking about deer migration corridor; Fish & Game; asking about whether Fish & Game has weighed in. Answer: The County is reaching out to all interested public agencies and will continue to do so.
- ✓ Asking about PUD ordinance; is it still in effect? Answer: Yes, but the BOS recognizes that this ordinance should be considered for revision. Among other things, if the PUD is available in mountain, foothill, and valley portions of the County, the standards need to be made specific to these very different physical environments.
- ✓ Asking whether there are Oregon House representatives on the GPUAC. Answer: Yes, there are 2 Oregon House area representatives. County staff will continue to encourage GPUAC members to provide in-person, phone, or email input.
- ✓ River Highlands group will be pushing for the largest boundary in the River Highlands Community Plan Area.
- ✓ AB 32 comments – in the future, cars will be more energy and GHG efficient.
- ✓ The County should make a community wish list for retail, commercial services.