TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council
Attention: Laura C. Kuhn, City Manager

FROM: Barton Brierley, AICP, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: DIRECT STAFF AND THE CITY’S GENERAL PLAN UPDATE CONSULTANTS TO CREATE AND ANALYZE A REVISED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE FOR THE NEW GROWTH AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE DRAFT GENERAL PLAN; and

AUTHORIZE THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR TO FINALIZE A SCOPE OF WORK FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES TO CREATE AND ANALYZE A REVISED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE FOR THE NEW GROWTH AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE CONSULTANT CONTRACT TO PERMIT AN INCREASED SCOPE OF WORK AT AN ADDITIONAL COST NOT TO EXCEED $136,033.

INTRODUCTION:

The City has prepared a draft General Plan Update which includes a Preferred Land Use Alternative (PLUA). It also has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that analyzes this alternative. The Planning Commission recommended adoption of the General Plan with the exception of the PLUA for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area. The Commission was split evenly on whether to recommend the Jepson Ranch Option 2 or the Revised Focused Growth Alternative. (Attachment 1, Planning Commission Recommendations / Minutes, 9/22/14). On October 28, 2014, the City Council directed staff to create a revised land use alternative somewhere between the Revised Focused Growth Land Use Alternative, and the Jepson Ranch Revised Option 2 Plan, and to return this hybrid alternative, along with the other alternatives, to the City Council for their consideration. (Attachment 2, Minutes & Staff Summary Notes, City Council hearing, 10/28/14).

Because the draft General Plan includes and the EIR analyzes the original PLUA, consideration of alternative land use designations will trigger the need to ensure that the environmental review adequately addressed the proposed project, and the General Plan document itself will need revisions to reflect the changes (i.e. maps, charts, tables and text throughout the documents refer to the PLUA previously identified). The scope of modifications to the City Council’s ultimately preferred land use plan will determine what is required for the environmental review and General Plan document modifications. Staff seeks:

(1) Direction on the revised land use alternative that the Council wishes to have staff and the consultant prepare and analyze, and

(2) Approval for consultant services to do this additional preparation and analysis.
PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission held three meetings (8/5/14, 8/19/14, and 9/22/14) to consider a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed General Plan Update. At these meetings the Planning Commission recommended approval of the following components of the General Plan Update:

- All Infill/Focus Areas as shown on the Preferred Land Use Alternatives;
- A plan for the Northeast Growth Area as shown on the Preferred Land Use Alternative;
- The Commission was split evenly between the Revised Focused Growth Alternative and the Jepson Ranch Option 2 Plan for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area.
- All General Plan Diagram and Policy revisions identified in the “Compilation of Comments Received on the General Plan Update & Addendum”; and

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Below is a description of the main alternatives considered to date. The table on the following page compares these alternatives.

Preferred Land Use Alternative (Attachment 3). This alternative includes plans for eventual development of the entire East of Leisure Town Growth Area with largely residential uses plus school, park and neighborhood commercial uses. It includes plans for eventual development of the Northeast Growth Area with industrial, commercial and residential uses. It also includes changes to promote infill development on a number of Infill/Focus areas.

Original Focused Growth Alternative (Attachment 4). This alternative included about 1/3 of the East of Leisure Town Growth Area (the Brighton Landing property and some property north of Elmira Road along Leisure Town Road). It also included a small amount of industry and commercial development in the Northeast Growth Area with much of the remaining land remaining agricultural. It did not include land use changes to the Infill/Focus areas.

Revised Focused Growth Alternative (Attachment 5). This alternative also included about 1/3 of the East of Leisure Town Growth Area, though it included different properties (the Brighton Landing property, the property to the south of Brighton Landing, the Papin Property to the north of Elmira Road and the future park site north of Elmira Road). It included the same small amount of industry and commercial development in the Northeast Growth area as the Original Focused Growth Alternative with most remaining lands designated as Urban Reserve instead of Agriculture. Unlike the Original Focused Growth Alternative, it does include changes to promote infill development on the Infill/Focus areas.

Jepson Ranch Revised Option 2 (Attachment 6). This alternative includes the entire East of Leisure Town Growth Area but with fewer dwelling units, park, school and neighborhood commercial sites. It included the same plan for the Northeast Growth Area and the Infill/Focus areas as the Preferred Land Use Alternative.

Hybrid Alternative & Objectives (Attachment 7). This alternative would include an amount of land and number of dwelling units in the East of Leisure Town Growth Area that is roughly halfway between the Jepson Revised Option 2 and the Revised Focused Growth alternatives. Staff has not yet created a map to show this alternative. Staff recommends that this be
developed following the objectives shown in Attachment 7. This would include designating the remaining land in the East of Leisure Town Growth area as urban reserve. It would include the Northeast Growth Area as shown in the Preferred Land Use Alternative, but would include policies to have employment development precede residential development there and require specific plans to determine final layout of zoning. It would include the Infill/Focus areas.

**Current Adopted General Plan (Attachment 8).** For reference, Attachment 8 shows the current adopted General Plan. Of note, the current General Plan includes an approximate 1000 foot wide strip of land along the east side of Leisure Town Road designated primarily as estate residential.

**Comparison of Land Use Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Preferred Land Use Alternative</th>
<th>Original Focused Growth Alternative</th>
<th>Revised Focused Growth Alternative</th>
<th>Jepson Ranch Revised Option 2 Alternative</th>
<th>Hybrid Alternative (Subject to change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of Leisure Town Growth Area</td>
<td>Entire area planned for 4,680 dwellings plus schools, parks, &amp; neighborhood commercial uses</td>
<td>About 1/3 of area planned for 1,390 dwellings plus schools, parks &amp; neighborhood commercial uses, remaining areas agriculture</td>
<td>About 1/3 of area planned for 1,565 dwellings plus schools, parks, and neighborhood commercial uses, remaining areas agriculture</td>
<td>Entire area planned for 3,470 dwellings plus schools, parks, &amp; neighborhood commercial uses</td>
<td>About 2/3 of area planned for around 2,500 dwellings plus schools, parks, &amp; neighborhood commercial uses, remaining areas urban reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Growth Area</td>
<td>Entire area planned for about 1/2 industry, 1/4 residential (1,459 dwellings), 1/8 commercial, 1% urban reserve plus other uses</td>
<td>About 1/10th of area planned for about half industry and half commercial, remaining areas agriculture</td>
<td>About 1/10th of area planned for about half industry and half commercial, remaining areas urban reserve</td>
<td>Same as Preferred Land Use Alternative</td>
<td>Same as Preferred Land Use Alternative, except with timing policies and specific planning required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill/Focus Areas</td>
<td>Includes changes to promote infill development</td>
<td>No changes to current designation of infill areas</td>
<td>Includes changes to promote infill development</td>
<td>Includes changes to promote infill development</td>
<td>Includes changes to promote infill development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CREATION OF A REVISED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE:

The City Council considered the options described above and received public testimony at a public hearing on October 28, 2014. The City Council directed staff to prepare a hybrid land use alternative for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area that is roughly halfway between the Revised Focused Growth Alternative and the Revised Option 2 Alternative. The Council asked that this revised land use alternative be brought back to the Council for consideration, along with other land use alternatives discussed (Preferred Land Use Alternative, Revised Option 2, and Revised Focused Growth).

Staff is requesting further Council direction on the alternative it wishes staff to prepare and analyze. Staff has suggested proposed objectives for creating the Hybrid Alternative (Attachment 7). The Council can direct staff to prepare the hybrid following these objectives, modify these objectives, or direct staff to prepare the revised alternative following one of the other alternatives listed.

PRELIMINARY COST PROPOSAL:

As directed by the City Council, the City's consultant, PlaceWorks, has prepared a draft scope of work and cost estimate for assisting in the creation of a revised land use alternative for the New Growth Areas. This scope of work also includes a feasibility and cost analysis for the new land use alternative; a preliminary infrastructure cost evaluation and financing viability study; and additional information and analysis required for the General Plan Update EIR as needed, based on the final revised General Plan (Attachment 9, Consultant Draft Scope of Work & Cost Proposal).

The proposal includes assistance in preparation of the revised land use diagram and revised development projections. The scope includes feasibility and cost analysis of any revised land use map, including an assessment of utility and infrastructure needs, cost estimates for those facilities, and evaluation of financing viability and potential cost impacts to development. Revised CEQA analysis would be included in this scope of work, to ensure that the environmental documents address the potential impacts of a revised plan.

At the City Council meeting it was suggested that the City contract with an independent counsel to review the CEQA analysis for the various alternatives. This is not included in the scope. The consultant has its own counsel and will seek advice from counsel as it performs the work. If the Council wishes, staff can obtain a cost proposal for including independent counsel.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The City has prepared the Final EIR analyzing the potential environmental effects of the proposed General Plan Update using the Preferred Land Use Alternative and the Energy & Conservation Action Strategy. Following City Council selection of a Revised Land Use Alternative, City staff and PlaceWorks will prepare the final environmental documents for City Council action.
The potential scenarios for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review under this alternative are outlined in the proposed scope of work. The City must review the final proposed General Plan and determine whether the final revisions will require any additional review under CEQA. The objectives outlined above include recommending that the Hybrid Alternative be developed with the intention to rely on the existing EIR analysis as much as possible. This approach would provide for analysis to determine consistency with the findings of the Draft and Final EIR prepared for the General Plan Update.

Various other alternatives may require different levels of additional environmental review.

**OTHER AGENCIES:**

The General Plan Update requires the City to consult with outside agencies on issues of concern. Consultation with two particular agencies is ongoing:

**Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC):** The ALUC will review the General Plan Update, including the various land use plans considered for the new growth areas at their meeting on January 8, 2015. Following City Council direction regarding a final land use plan, the ALUC will review the plan and provide a determination on the plan’s consistency with the Nut Tree Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the Travis AFB Land Use Compatibility Plan. The ALUC’s findings will be included in the final approval documents brought to the City Council for action.

**Solano Irrigation District (SID):** The City is currently negotiating revisions to the Master Water Agreement (MWA) with the District. The revised agreement will establish terms for the provision of City water service to any newly designated urban areas on the General Plan land use diagram and for conversion of agricultural land to urban uses. The MWA anticipates the ongoing discussions to consider extending urban growth out as far as the location of the Urban Growth Boundary. The terms of that agreement may not be different from the Preferred Land Use Alternative if the entire Growth Areas are designated either for urban land uses or as urban reserve. However, further discussions will continue with the district.

**PROJECT SCHEDULE:**

If the City Council directs staff to proceed with preparing a revised land use alternative, staff would prepare the revised land use diagram, additional studies and analysis, and would return to the Planning Commission for a special meeting at the end of March. Prior to that meeting, staff would provide the final draft plan to the ALUC for review. Following the Planning Commission’s recommendation, the General Plan Update would be scheduled for City Council consideration, estimated to be by Summer 2015.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Placeworks has prepared a scope of work with a cost estimate of $136,033 to augment the original consultant services agreement for the General Plan Update (Attachment 9). This amount includes $66,760 for a feasibility and cost analysis to determine whether the chosen alternative is financially viable. The scope will include funds for consultant participation at up to five public meetings.
In 2010, the General Plan Update was approved with a $2.5 million budget for staff and consultants over an approximately two to three year process. To allow for an extended schedule and additional work, the overall budget has increased to approximately $2.7 million. The requested amendments will increase the consultant services budget from $1.89 million to $2.03 million, and the total General Plan Update budget to $2.8 million. The General Plan Update project is funded by the General Fund and would be anticipated repaid by the future General Plan Update cost recovery fee.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. By simple motion, direct staff and the City’s General Plan Update consultants to create a new land use alternative for the new growth areas identified by the draft General Plan Update, following the objectives identified in Attachment 7 of the staff report, present it to the Planning Commission for a recommendation, and present it to the City Council for action.

2. By simple motion, authorize the Community Development Director to finalize a scope of work for consultant services to create a new land use alternative for the General Plan Update and to amend the General Plan Update consultant contract to permit an increased scope of work at an additional cost not to exceed $136,033.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1: Planning Commission Recommendations / Minutes, September 22, 2014
Attachment 2: Minutes & Staff Summary Notes, October 28, 2014 City Council Meeting
Attachment 3: Preferred Land Use Alternative – New Growth Areas
Attachment 4: Original Focused Growth Alternative
Attachment 5: Revised Focused Growth Alternative
Attachment 6: Jepson Ranch Revised Option 2
Attachment 7: Objectives for new Hybrid Alternative
Attachment 8: Current Adopted General Plan for New Growth Areas
Attachment 9: Consultant Draft Scope of Work & Cost Proposal
CALL TO ORDER:
The special meeting of the Vacaville Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Niccoli at 7:200 p.m. (the meeting was delayed due to technical difficulties).

A. ROLL CALL:
   Present: Chairman Niccoli, Vice-Chair Wilkins, Commissioner Aldrich, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner La Bar, Commissioner Woolsey.
   Absent: Commissioner Nadasdy
   Also Present: Community Development Director Brierley, City Planner Buderi, senior Planner Hays, Associate Civil Engineer Hilton, Public Works Director Hartwig, Housing Director Cantu, Assistant Director of Public Works Cunningham, and Director of Utilities Cunningham.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

C. COMMUNICATIONS:
   1. Letter from MG Property Management
   2. Letter from Regina Kaehler
   3. Notes from Chairman Niccoli regarding the Commission’s discussion.

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
   Commissioner Aldrich moved, Commissioner La Bar seconded to approve the agenda. Motion approved 6-0.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
   None

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR:
   None

G. PUBLIC HEARING:

1. PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE
   On August 19, 2014, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the proposed General Plan Update, the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy (ECAS), and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzing the potential environmental effects of the proposed plans. The Planning Commission voted to:
   - Recommend that the City Council certify the EIR and adopt the ECAS.
   - Continue their consideration of the proposed General Plan Update. The Planning Commission discussed considering potential revisions to the proposed Plan for their final recommendation to the City Council. The Commission expressed interest in considering a smaller, more focused growth plan, including for the proposed East of Leisure Town Road and Northeast Growth Areas.
   The General Plan establishes land use, policies, and actions to guide decisions relating to economic development, community character, circulation, land use, open space, the environment, and public health and safety. The General Plan will guide land use and development decisions for new growth areas and for existing areas within the City.

   Joanna Jansen, from Placeworks, the General Plan consultant provided an overview of the meeting. She reviewed where we are in the process and the different options that will be considered. She clarified the 2035 horizon year and full buildout projections. She also provided an overview of the reduced horizon year growth alternative.
Chairman Niccoli reviewed the August 19 meeting, adding that this meeting is an extension of that meeting. He also read the communication that he submitted for this meeting. His proposed motion read as follows:

That the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the General Plan with a revised land use diagram that:
1. Retains the land use designations for the Focus (Infill) Areas as proposed by the Preferred Land Use Alternative.
2. Focused Growth in the East of Leisure Town Road areas to the South of Elmira Road, with the exception of the Community Park and accommodations for Mr. Papin’s property, proposed in the Focused Growth Alternative. Residential unit growth would specifically be the approved Brighton Landing project at 780 units, and the Batch property at 765 units for a total of 1,545 units.

Includes the Focused Growth Land Use Alternative for the Northeast Growth Area, with the exception that land currently designated as Agriculture would be designated as Urban Reserve.

Vice-Chair Wilkins commented that Chairman Niccoli’s recommendation reflects the items that were discussed at the previous meeting.

Commissioner La Bar commented that she was in favor of a reduction in residential units, but she was not concerned about the commercial and industrial designations. She requested more information regarding Option 2.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED:

Bob Panzer, Vacaville resident, stated that Steven Fawl’s letter reflects what the City should do, and priorities should trump unneeded housing and temporary jobs. He commented that the proposed Focused Growth is the best alternative. He emphasized that quality trumps quantity.

Dennis Ferguson, Vacaville resident, commented about the current construction in Brighton Landing and asked about the pumping system into Old Alamo Creek.

City Planner Buderi reviewed the construction period and when a permanent pumping station would be installed.

Randy Papin, 6140 Leisure Town Road, questioned if they were starting the process all over again and what would happen to his property. He commented that he fought hard for the original designation.

Chairman Niccoli confirmed that the intention was to leave the Papin property as neighborhood commercial.

City Planner Buderi reviewed the implications for Mr. Papin’s property with the Focused Growth Alternative, adding that there would be no change to the designation.

Rich Burke, Vacaville Resident, near Leisure Town and Alamo, requested that the City plan ahead for the appropriate infrastructure for any growth that is approved. Traffic impacts are a large issue and the Focused Growth Alternative will help that, but it does not address what the impacts will be. He commented that it would be unintelligent to approve an update where they don’t know what the impacts are. He added that it is important to try to minimize the impacts, but you don’t know what intersections will be impacted in a significant negative way. He requested that they don’t approve anything until the traffic infrastructure is in place and wanted the City to require the final plan to be kept LOS C.

City Planner Buderi noted that the EIR analyzed the alternatives prior to the finalization of the plan.
If a plan is approved that is different, they would go back to ensure that mitigation is addressed.

Associate Civil Engineer Hilton clarified that the EIR does address the LOS at intersections as a conservative approach. He added that each project will need to do project level analysis to determine that it is consistent, adding that mitigation will be required when it goes to LOS D.

Leigh Coop, Director of Facilities at the Vacaville Unified School District, introduced Jane Schemieh, Associate Superintendent for Administrative Services. Ms. Coop commented that they have been involved in the process for the past four years. She noted that they were provided with Option 2. With 3,300 dwelling units, they would look at the number of students that it could generate. She reviewed the three school sites proposed in the General Plan. In Option 2, there would be about 900 K-8 students. She also reviewed the number of students that would be generated by the different options. Depending on funding, they cannot guarantee any time for construction of those schools. There currently is no State Facilities bond, and no State program, so they can’t rely on a matching fund from the State. She added that they will work with land owners to provide funding.

Tom Phillippi, Phillippi Engineering, representing the land owners east of Leisure Town Road, stated that Option 2 for the area east of Leisure Town Road reduces the number of proposed units and provides enough funding for much needed infrastructure, adding that the City does not have the funding to complete Jepson Parkway. He stated that Option 2 will fund Jepson Parkway, will provide for 6 lanes, and will fund the sewer system for the area. He noted that the City will continue to have impacts even if more homes are not built. Option 2 provides for right of way dedication, the Focused Growth Alternative does nothing to address the Leisure Town Road problems. This is the only area in the region that is available for major development. The Focused Growth alternative would permanently prohibit development and any potential for extension of sewer lines, parks and trails. Option 2 includes 72 acres of park land which goes a long way to reduce the unmet park needs. It would also provide 125 acres of trails and recreational opportunities. The Focused Growth Alternative does nothing to provide bike trails or other amenities for the Community. Vacaville will continue to receive pressure to grow, and the Council will change. The property owners of Brighton Landing and other land owners east of Leisure Town Road have committed to providing funding to SID and are committed to preserving agriculture land now and in the future. The Focused Growth Alternative does nothing except add 600 additional homes which will not address roadways or protect and preserve agriculture. In response to questions from Vice-Chair Wilkins regarding the availability of funding, he reviewed the fees assessed per resident as each section is developed. They are required to do an EIR, which provides the opportunity with each section to address infrastructure and provide funding. If at any point the EIR notes that there cannot be mitigation, the development cannot go forward.

Bob Warschawski, Vacaville resident, stated that the EIR makes it clear that the Focused Growth Alternative is the most favorable. He stated that it is important to ask what plan benefits the few, the many, and who will benefit from this plan. The community will bear the cost, of the plan.

Nancy Martin, Maple Road resident, stated that this is an issue of public trust. Discussions with the developers have not provided a sense of trust or that they will be taken care of, adding that the area residents do not feel that they are part of the process. They need to think hard about the many citizens who have talked on this proposal and the residents need to see the follow through of promised parks and schools before the citizens will trust the developers.

Dan Sharp, Vacaville resident, along with Jim Gilliam and Dan Monical, spoke regarding the JLM Ranch.

Mr. Monical reviewed the history of the 147 acres that have been farmed and passed down through his family.

Jim Gillam commented that he was asked to monitor the General Plan Update on their behalf. The family has asked him to determine what would be best for this property over the long term. He noted
that the Preferred Land Use Alternative would be the best use of the property.

Dan Sharp commented that based on the shift in direction at the August 19 meeting, they changed their ideas to provide a positive mix with executive housing near the freeway which would allow them to compete with surrounding communities. There would be office opportunities that provide jobs, and also provide a good buffer with adjacent agriculture. It would provide enhancements for existing residents and commercial services as well as enough development to provide needed infrastructure. He commented that a reduction of growth in the northeast area will not reduce traffic until the Orange Drive extension is completed. He acknowledged that development won’t occur for many years but this is an opportunity to plan for the future.

Mr. Gillam reviewed how development within this area will bring infrastructure across the canal to Orange Drive so that it can be used by industrial areas. With the limited number of units in the Focused Growth Alternative, there would not be sufficient funding to extend the sewer to the Northeast Growth area. The Option 2 Alternative would allow the infrastructure to leap frog up to the industrial areas.

Mr. Sharp clarified the number of homes that would be proposed in that area.

Sam Miller, representing the Ramos property, which is north Hawkins and east of Leisure Town Road, noted his support for Option 2. He stated that there has not been a quantitative analysis of the traffic for the Focused Growth Alternative. The EIR has been approved that says that the number 2030 through 2034 with some limitations has been evaluated. It will take 3,300 homes to accomplish the extension of sewer lines to Leisure Town Road. He affirmed that they are maintaining policies addressed in the EIR and that the Policies noted, will not change in Option 2. They would ask that they add a policy that there be a requirement for the opportunity to double the acreage that is required for parks, and incentives for them to provide more for parks. He added that they are doing their best to provide what is economically necessary to develop these and the surrounding areas. They will meet the agricultural buffers and the needs for park area and would like policies to allow for maintenance of billboards along the freeway.

Vice-Chair Wilkins noted that they have to look at the spacial relationship of development which occurs in stages over time. In the next 20-25 years, another Commission may be addressing similar issues. None of this will happen over night or possibly the next 10 or more years and may not occur during the life of the plan.

Mr. Miller stated that they need sufficient basis for the issuance of debt to pay for the improvements that are needed in advance of the facility. He reviewed projects that he worked on where improvements were installed prior to the construction of homes. There has been a reliance on cash flow to pay for improvements rather than debt. This causes parks that are not installed or street improvements not made. You have the tools available to do those things so that improvements are installed first. Tools are available and can be used effectively, critical mass allows you to do that.

Glen Matsuhara, part of the ownership group that owns 248 acres, stated that he had invested in the property a year and a half ago based on the proposed designation of the Preferred Land Use Alternative that has been in place for the past two years. He asked for clarification of how his property would be affected and if the proposal excludes the property to the north.

Chairman Niccoli clarified that the Focused Growth Alternative would exclude the parcels to the north.

Mr. Matsuhara noted that the last General Plan was updated in 1990. The Focused Growth Alternative, minus Brighton Landing, only provides about 800 more units. Adopting the Focused Growth Alternative would be short sighted for a 20-25 year document. He noted that he would support Option 2 as a reasonable plan. To adopt something in the 1,500 range would be short sighted. He emphasized that the plan will not develop over night and there are many other steps that they will have to go through before development occurs. When development is proposed, there will be EIRs
and other studies will occur. He commented that it takes a certain amount of development to pay for infrastructure. This is a long term planning document and they need to plan for orderly growth.

Chairman Niccoli clarified that the Focused Growth Alternative calls for 9,000 units, which would be enough houses for the next 30 years. The Preferred Land Use Alternative provides for 15,000 houses, enough for 50 years. The Focused Growth Alternative is more prudent.

Mr. Matsuhara commented that the numbers being used take into account properties that have not developed. We can’t assume that everything that is approved will develop, the market and economy will determine when and where development occurs.

Chairman Niccoli commented that there are other sites within the City that those homes can be developed and should not all occur on Leisure Town Road.

Mr. Matsuhara stated that east of Leisure Town Road is a logical alternative and forms a logical physical boundary to the City. He added that they would also dedicate additional land as a buffer.

Chairman Niccoli commented that we don’t have to provide a house for everyone who wants one.

Laura Peters, Locke Padon Colony, noted her appreciation for the time and effort that has gone into this proposal. She felt that we are not being good stewards of land if a large number of houses are proposed, adding that there is plenty of other land to develop within the City. She stated that it is important to work with the schools, because where there are excellent schools, it raises property values and provides better citizens.

Steven Fawl, Locke Padon Colony, reminded the Commission where this process started. Traffic has always been an issue, adding that he worked to move the proposed bypass away from the front of his home. They cannot add more people and not also affect the traffic. The driving force of development is the developers, but in the past few years, the amount of permits being issued has gone down. He noted that the EIR was written 2011, assuming that there would be a 15% growth. He stated that the EIR projections have not been right yet. The EIR said the City would have a 2.3% growth, but ABAG says a .86% growth is typical. He said the trends show the City does not need 9,000 homes, but could get by with 8,000 homes. Development predictions in the past have not been correct and they can’t estimate the number of units needed for each year. He added that we don’t need additional development east of Leisure Town Road. In the EIR, what can we expect to look like in the next 20 years, we don’t need that much land to satisfy the needs of the City. There are other important services such as hospitals that are not available and there are no other areas to provide for that type of service. He added that the Focused Growth Alternative is the environmentally preferred plan.

Lynn Holbrook Katleba Lane, provided written information about the community, and statistics about Vacaville compared to the national average. She commented that employment opportunities are limited, so we should focus on businesses coming to Vacaville. A responsible growth plan would decrease pollution.

Dan Johnson, Southtown resident, stated that they don’t need the proposed number of homes in Vacaville, adding that he likes the mix of open area and houses. He commented that everyone has a reason for their position, but it is important to have a vision of what we want Vacaville to be in the future and not to over reach. The Planning Commission will be setting the vision for 20 years. He supports the Focused Growth Alternative.

Sharon Harriet, Maple road, commented that the east side of town is the ugly step-sister. There is room to spread out and growth can occur throughout town. She requested that they keep open space and agriculture.

Ellen Fawl, Locke Padon Colony, and Chairman of the Orderly Growth Committee, reviewed the
many other people who are interested and would like to attend meetings but are unable to.  She stated that there are many voices in Vacaville that are not heard.  She added that it is important to strike a balance and keep growth focused, adding that agriculture is important.  Public policy many change in the future and they need options.

Jeff Warner, Maple Road resident, stated that he likes a small town, but understands that growth is necessary.  He was concerned about traffic on Leisure Town Road, near the senior community.  He asked if there could be access provided through the senior community so that they can access the light.  He felt that widening Leisure Town Road will not help cars getting onto the road.

Tony Ceres commented that he has an eight minute commute and passes three parks on his way to work.  He added that Vacaville has become a special place to raise his family.

Clara Ceres commented that she loves living in Vacaville because of the open space and ability to see the stars at night and the green open space.  She added that Lagoon Valley is a great place to hike because of the wildlife.

Kay, Vacaville resident, commented that Option 2 appears to be an appeasement, and that the silent majority of Vacaville residents feel that the Focused Growth Alternative is the best proposal.  She had environmental quality of life concerns.  She noted the example of San Jose that is no longer livable and the quality of life for residents there has gone down since she was raised there.  She then compared San Luis Obispo, where the growth and quality of life has been maintained and property values are kept high.  She commented that Vacaville has a lot of open land and encouraged a high quality of life.

Roberto Valdez, Vacaville resident, had concerns with traffic impacts.  Vacaville is growing quickly without knowing or sorting out impacts and what the future will be.  He stated that it is important to understand that Vacaville citizens don’t have to agree with staff or Commissioners, it is our City, they can take action, and this is not the end.  He emphasized the importance of adopting the proposed Habitat Conservation plan and to look at all species.  The citizens have a right to challenge the City’s decisions.  He felt that the City should focus on the many empty schools and buildings rather than more growth.  Keep open space protected for species and keep crime low.  There is not adequate water for these proposals and there is no guarantee that we will continue to receive water from Lake Berryessa.

Vanessa, Vacaville resident commented that she has seen the effects of unfocused growth and development that ruins scenery.

Public Comment closed.

Chairman Niccoli commented that he felt strongly that the Focused Growth is the best alternative.  Increased traffic, crime and pollution would occur with the Preferred Land Use Alternative or Option 2 and would increase the population by almost half.  He emphasized the importance of thinking about what things will be affected with an increased population.  He noted concern about hospital capacity with two existing hospitals that are land locked with limited capacity.  He wants Vacaville to retain the character that is has now, understanding that we might not get bike paths or sewer lines, but that is acceptable.  The Preferred Land Use Alternative would have impacts.  He supports the Focused Growth Alternative as outlined in his comments.

Commissioner Johnson thanked everyone for being engaged in this process.  He was encouraged that school district members were present.  He commented that planning for the next 50 years is not a bad thing.  It is important to get to a place where the City Council can deal with an issue without many people attending.  The Council will have a wealth of information to make a decision on.  He expressed concerns regarding too much traffic, housing, commercial development, too little parks, and not having a good jobs housing balance.  Too little infrastructure for Leisure Town Road, and too little money for schools.  He expressed concern about how we address those issues.  What mitigation
measures are in place to address those and how many houses east of Leisure town Road are appropriate is too little and he stated that he was in favor of keeping schools in neighborhoods. He added that 1,500 homes does not provide any improvements, and if we do nothing, we will be impacted, but won’t have funds for improvements. Is Option 2, too many homes, right now it is, but if you are planning for a 20-25 year horizon, if traffic is mitigated it would not be bad. He noted his support for Option 2. If we do it right, and plan for the future, people will have certainty of what is proposed. He commented that the school district and current incumbents are not in agreement with how to handle surplus property, so he is encouraged that properties will not be sold off in the future.

Commissioner Woolsey stated that he understands both points of the Focused Growth and Option 2. He commented that he doesn’t want urban sprawl and wants Vacaville to grow responsibly. If we don’t need it, don’t build it. If the way to mitigate traffic is to build enough to solve the issues, he would be in favor of that. He noted that he would be in favor of Option 2, which may not be built out for 20-25 years, but it makes sense.

Commissioner La Bar acknowledged that they have been working on this process for many years. She noted that she had an issue with the Preferred Alternative, and was shocked by a build out figure of 15,000 homes, but did not feel that the Focused Growth Alternative is appropriate either. She agreed that there should be less development on Leisure Town Road, but as developments occur, so will improvements. She felt that there needs to be a good compromise between the two sides, adding that no plan will make everyone happy. She stated that she would support Option 2, with 3,300 homes, adding that City staff and developers have a strong integrity and will ensure that parks are developed.

Commissioner Aldrich also acknowledged that this has been a hard decision. She lives east of Leisure Town Road, and has watched what has happened to the traffic, adding that it needs to be fixed. Existing development will bring traffic and they also have to think of the young people in town and infrastructure needs to be provided. The City needs to be able to pay for infrastructure and if we wait, it will be too expensive. She noted that east of Leisure Town Road may not develop within the next 20 years, but there is the opportunity to provide infrastructure that is desperately needed. She stated that she was in support of Option 2.

Vice-Chair Wilkins stated that he once fully endorsed growth when it was done appropriately and viability of a community was enhanced. His concern with growth today is making development pay for itself. Schools aren’t being built, parks not developed until the development is well established, roads not being put in. He felt that this is the fault of the funding process. Communities need to be built as they are envisioned. He commented that the Council will need to rehash the issue, but wanted to provide them with a solid recommendation of a compromise and a sense of what the mood of the community is. He added that he was in favor of growth that assures vitality and would support the Focused Growth Alternative, unless there is something that would blend Option 2 and the Focused Growth Alternative.

Commissioner Woolsey stated that he was changing his vote in favor of the Focused Growth Alternative, because that is what the people want and he does not want to increase traffic.

Vice-Chair Wilkins felt strongly that they need to give the City Council a 6-0 vote, and sensed that they were close. He added that he would be willing to meet with the different parties to see if they could reach a compromise.

Commissioner Aldrich stated that they want infrastructure, but not all the homes. She questioned if they reach a compromise with fewer homes, would they be able to get the infrastructure that they need.

Tom Phillippi stated that the land owners are willing to meet to discuss compromises, but there are costs.

Vice-Chair Wilkins questioned if it would be beneficial to meet so that they can stay as close to Option
2 as possible. He was concerned that it will be at least 15 years before commercial development will occur based on residences. He felt that this is counterintuitive, we should have the jobs first, not the residences.

Mr. Phillippi noted that a 3-3 vote is a message to the Council. People are in favor of creating a tax base along the freeway, and the issue is if a large use comes in, they would create an assessment district to pay for the improvements. If you create an assessment district, you need value in land. If large swaths of land are agriculture, it lowers the value for the assessment district. If it has a General plan designation of residential, it provides the value to sell bonds to create the assessment district to install the sewer.

Chairman Niccoli commented that the City staff are experts and he is confident that they can rely on them to determine what infrastructure is needed. He noted that an option would be to continue the item to receive more input.

Commissioner Johnson stated that a 3-3 vote sends the message that there are tough decisions to be made.

Vice-Chair Wilkins questions if Option 2 will pencil out and generate the fees needed to provide infrastructure.

Mr. Phillippi reviewed the work and designing that has occurred to show that it will pencil out. He has done extensive cost estimates about what improvements will cost. He provided examples of projects that they have worked on where the developers dedicated land up front, free and clear for park dedication.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Commissioner La Bar moved, Commissioner Johnson seconded to recommend to the City Council Option 2 for the East of Leisure Town Road area; Option 2 for the Northeast Growth Area, except for the Jackson property to remain as in the Preferred Land Use Alternative, and, that they retain the land use designations for the Focus Infill areas as proposed in the Preferred Land Use Alternative.

Motion failed 3-3 (Niccoli, Wilkins, Woolsey, no)

Vice-Chair Wilkins moved, Commissioner Woolsey seconded that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the General Plan with a revised land use diagram that:
1. Retains the land use designations for the Focus (Infill) Areas as proposed by the Preferred Land Use Alternative.
2. Focuses Growth in the East of Leisure Town Road areas to the South of Elmira Road, with the exception of the Community Park with accommodations for Mr. Papin’s property as proposed in the Preferred Land Use Alternative. Residential unit growth would specifically be the approved Brighton Landing project at 780 units, and the Batch property at 765 units for a total of 1,545 units.
3. Includes the Focused Growth Land Use Alternative for the Northeast Growth Area, with the exception that the land currently designated as Agriculture would be designated as Urban Reserve.

Motion failed 3-3 (La Bar, Johnson & Aldrich, no)

Community Development Director Brierley suggested the following motion:

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the General Plan with a revised Land use Diagram that:
1. Retains the land use designations for the Focus (Infill) Areas as proposed by the Preferred Land Use alternative.
2. The Planning Commission was evenly split between Option 2 (as proposed in the letter from
Phillippi Engineering dated September 17, 2014) and the Focused Growth Alternative for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area.

3. Includes the Northeast Growth Area as shown in the Preferred Land Use Alternative.

Commissioner Johnson moved, Commissioner Aldrich seconded that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the General Plan with a revised land use diagram as stated by Director Brierley

Motion approved 6-0.

H. COMMISSION COMMENTS:
Chairman Niccoli thanked the public for their attendance at the meeting.

I. ADJOURNMENT:
There being no further business to discuss at this regular meeting of the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Page
Recording Secretary
1. ROLL CALL
Mayor Hardy called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Vacaville City Hall Council Chamber.

Present:  Councilmembers Harris, Hunt, Rowlett, Vice Mayor Mashburn, Mayor Hardy
Absents:  None
Also Present:  City Attorney Jerry Hobrecht, City Manager Laura Kuhn, and City Clerk Michelle Thornbrugh.

CONVENE TO CLOSED SESSION 6:00 p.m.
Pursuant to California Government Code, Section 54950, et seq., the City Council convened to closed session at 6:04 p.m.

A. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR
(Pursuant to Section 54957.6)
Negotiation Parties:
Agency Negotiator: Laura C. Kuhn, City Manager
Employee Organizations: Vacaville Police Officers Association and Vacaville Firefighters Association

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – Initiation of Litigation
(Pursuant to Section 54956.9)
Number of cases:  One

RECONVENE 7:00 p.m.
The Council reconvened to regular session at 7:03 p.m. and reported that the Fire Chief had been directed to meet and confer with the Vacaville Firefighters Association and the Police Chief had been directed to meet with the Vacaville Police Officers Association.

2. INVOCATION followed by the PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
A moment of silence was observed and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilmember Hunt.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
On a motion by Councilmember Rowlett, seconded by Councilmember Hunt, the agenda for the regular meeting of October 28, 2014, was unanimously approved with the continuance of Items 8C and 8D to the Special City Council Meeting of November 18, 2014.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –
On a motion by Councilmember Rowlett, seconded by Vice Mayor Mashburn, the minutes of the regular City Council meeting of October 14, 2014, were unanimously approved.
5. PRESENTATIONS –

A. UPDATE BY UTILITIES DIRECTOR ROYCE CUNNINGHAM ON RECENT GROUNDWATER LEGISLATION

Presentation was received.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR –

On a motion by Councilmember Hunt; seconded by Councilmember Harris, the Council unanimously approved the item on the Consent Calendar.

A. RESOLUTION ACCEPTING PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE CITY OF VACAVILLE CLEAN ENERGY PROJECT PURSUANT TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF VACAVILLE AND SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC., DATED DECEMBER 20, 2012, - FACILITY IMPROVEMENT MEASURE (fim)#’S 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, & 13

7. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR – None

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VACAVILLE RESCINDING ORDINANCE NO. 1431 AND AMENDING CHAPTER 13.20 OF THE VACAVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO WATER CONSERVATION IN NORMAL, DROUGHT AND EMERGENCY CONDITIONS

The Mayor opened and closed the public hearing with no comments provided. On a motion by Councilmember Harris, seconded by Councilmember Hunt, the Council unanimously introduced the subject ordinance. The title was read by the City Clerk.

B. ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VACAVILLE ADDING SECTION 14.20.274 TO THE VACAVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO EXPEDITED PERMITTING PROCEDURES FOR SMALL RESIDENTIAL ROOFTOP SOLAR SYSTEMS

The Mayor opened and closed the public hearing with no comments provided. On a motion by Councilmember Harris, seconded by Councilmember Rowlett, the Council unanimously introduced the subject ordinance. The title was read by the City Clerk.

C. Continued to November 18, 2014 Special Meeting; RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VACAVILLE DENYING THE PUBLIC CONVENIENCE OR NECESSITY (PCN) REQUEST TO SELL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (BEER AND WINE) FROM THE QUICK WAY GAS STATION AND CONVENIENCE STORE AT 401 MERCHANT STREET

D. Continued to November 18, 2014 Special Meeting; RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VACAVILLE APPROVING THE NUT TREE RANCH POLICY PLAN AMENDMENT TO ALLOW MEDICAL OFFICE AND
HEALTH & BEAUTY SERVICES IN BUILDING AA, LOCATED WITHIN NUT TREE RETAIL PHASE 3

9. BUSINESS

A. STATUS REPORT ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND REQUEST FOR DIRECTION FOR NEXT STEPS IN THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

On a motion by Vice Mayor Mashburn, seconded by Councilmember Hunt, the Council unanimously directed staff to prepare a revised land use alternative, including a plan for the East of Leisure Town growth area roughly halfway between the Revised Focused Growth Alternative and the Revised Option 2 including any public input given on the hybrid to date, and bring back the hybrid plan with the all the other plans as presented for consideration and direction.

10. REPORTS OF CITY MANAGER

A. BUDGET UPDATE

11. REPORTS OF CITY COUNCIL -

12. PAYMENT OF CLAIMS –

On a motion by Councilmember Rowlett, seconded by Vice Mayor Mashburn, the check registers dated October 15 and 22, 2014, and payroll register dated October 15, 2014 were unanimously ordered paid.

13. ADJOURNMENT -

There being no further business, the regular meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle A. Thornbrugh, City Clerk
City Council Meeting Summary Notes –
Status Report on the General Plan Update and Request for Direction for the Next Steps in
the General Plan Update Process
October 28, 2014

The following summary is based on notes taken at the meeting by Planning staff and does not represent the official minutes of the meeting. City Council direction and questions received at this meeting will be used to formulate the next City Council meeting on the General Plan Update.

Present: Mayor Hardy, Vice-Mayor Mashburn, Council members Rowlett, Harris and Hunt

Also Present: City Attorney Jerry Hobrecht, City Manager Laura Kuhn, Community Development Director Barton Brierley, City Planner Fred Buderi, Senior Planner Tyra Hays, Public Works Director Steve Hartwig, Utilities Department Director Royce Cunningham; Placeworks Associate Principal Joanna Jansen

City staff and Placeworks, the City’s General Plan consultants, have completed the General Plan document, the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and the Energy and Conservation Action Strategy (ECAS), collectively referred to as the General Plan Update (GPU), and have held hearings before the Planning Commission. The General Plan Update, ECAS, and the Draft and Final EIR have been distributed to the City Council. The staff report prepared for this meeting provided a brief summary of these documents, reviewed the General Plan Update process, reviewed the Planning Commission’s recommended changes to the General Plan document, reviewed the Planning Commission hearings, reviewed community comments, and requested City Council direction on next steps for the General Plan Update.

City Councilmember Comments:

Councilmember Harris requested a summary of Planning Commission recommendations. Joanna Jansen, Placeworks consultant, read the Planning Commissions’ recommendation to the City Council from the staff report prepared for this meeting:

1. A motion was made to recommend that the City Council 1) Approve the Preferred Land Use Alternative for the infill areas; 2) Approve the landowners requested Option 2 for the East of Leisure Town Road growth area; and 3) Approve the Option 2 land uses for the Northeast growth area, with the exception of the Jackson Property (Willow Road at Kilkenney Road) which would remain as shown on the Preferred Land Use Alternative (shown in Attachment H, Comparison of alternatives– Revised Option 2). Motion failed 3 – 3.

2. A motion was made to recommend that the City Council 1) Approve the Preferred Land Use Alternative for the infill areas; 2) Approve the East of Leisure Town Road growth area that focuses growth south of Elmira Road with Brighton Landing at 780 dwelling units and Batch Property at 765 dwelling units, for a total of 1,545 dwelling units and with the Papin property to remain commercial as shown on the Preferred Land Use Alternative and; 3) Approve the Northeast growth area as shown on the Focused
Growth Alternative, except that all lands shown as Agriculture would instead be
designated as Urban Reserve (also shown in Attachment H – Revised Focused Growth
Alternative). **Motion failed 3 – 3.**

3. A third motion was made to recommend that the City Council 1) Approve the Preferred
Land Use Alternative for the infill areas; 2) To advise the City Council that the Planning
Commission was evenly split between the Focused Growth Alternative as described
above and Option 2 for the East of Leisure Town Road growth area; and 3) Approve the
Northeast growth area as shown on the Preferred Land Use Alternative. **Motion
passed 6 – 0.**

Community Development Director Brierley noted that the Planning Commission supported the majority of
the proposed General Plan. They don’t support the Preferred Land use Alternative for the East of
Leisure Town Road growth area.

Councilmember Hunt noted that we was concerned that the Planning Commission had not seen the
Option 2 land use plan that was presented at the meeting.

Councilmember Rowlett noted his desire to see the new Option 3 land use alternative map for the East of
Leisure Town Road growth area that proposes a compromise between the Preferred Land Use
Alternative and the Option 2 land use alternative.

**Public Comments:**

Tom Phillippi, Phillippi Engineering, clarified Councilman Hunt’s question regarding the revised Option 2
land use alternative presented that day, and stated that the revised Option 2 map illustrates the Planning
Commission’s recommendation to keep the Preferred Land Use Alternative for the Northeast growth
area, and includes the previously proposed Option 2 land use alternative for the East of Leisure Town
Road growth area. Mr. Phillippi noted the benefits of the Option 2 land use alternative (i.e., sufficient
development potential to fund infrastructure improvements, and the creation of new parks and trails). He
also noted that the proposed Revised Focus Growth land use alternative does not include sufficient
development potential to fund these improvements and amenities, and its adoption would be detrimental
to the future development of the Northeast growth area.

Councilmember Harris asked if there is a way to make adjustments to designate space between Elmira
Road and the Locke Paddon Colony as Urban Reserve instead of Agriculture (as shown on the Revised
Focused Growth land use alternative). She asked what would be the negatives to redesignating this
area as Urban Reserve. She also asked if the proposed Option 2 land use alternative would provide
infrastructure the Northeast growth area. Lastly, Councilmember Harris asked if new development would
benefit the construction of Jepson Parkway. Planning Director Brierley responded that a drawback of
urban reserve designation would be that it would not give the property owner’s certainty about the timing
of development of their properties, and it would not give the neighbors certainty about what develop may
occur next to them. He explained that a sewer line could run through the East of Leisure Town area that
eventually would serve the Northeast Growth Area. Public Works Director Hartwig explained the timing
of the Jepson Parkway construction and explained that development of the East of Leisure Town Growth
Area could dedicate right-of-way for the Parkway.

Sam Miller, representing Lewis Homes and the Ramos property owners stated he and his clients prefer
the Option 2 land use alternative. He would rather have an urban reserve designation than agricultural,
and would favor a design competition to determine which land would first be included. A copy of Mr.
Miller’s speaking notes was submitted to the City Council.
Anna Sanabria, a member of the Vacaville Reach Coalition, noted her appreciation for inclusion of the Rocky Hill Trail in the Draft General Plan, and discussed the current unsafe conditions of the unofficial trail used in the Rocky Hill neighborhood.

Steven Fawl, Locke Paddon Colony Resident, advocated the Revised Focused Growth land use alternative for three main reasons: homes, traffic, and jobs. Mr. Fawl expressed concern regarding the number of homes projected to be constructed annually through the horizon year of the proposed General Plan. He presented information showing the decline in residential construction over the past 20 years. He noted that fewer homes would require less costly infrastructure. Mr. Fawl also noted that funding for Jepson Parkway is not dependent on development. Lastly, he noted that development of more land does not equate to more jobs. The GPU EIR states that the City has adequate land for future development. Mr. Fawl submitted a letter discussing these topics in more detail. This letter was included in the staff report prepared for this meeting.

Councilmember Comments:
Vice Mayor Mashburn thanked Mr. Fawl for his data, then proceeded to state development is market-driven, and several (land use) plans haven’t been put up against the EIR yet. He wants a plan that protects Vacaville’s citizens and protects the City from a GPU referendum. He recommends that the City hire a CEQA attorney to review the plans and to compare them the GPU EIR. He placed emphasis on getting the best possible information and further analysis of the land use alternatives (provided in the staff report) before the Council provides direction to staff on how to proceed with the GPU process.

Councilmember Hunt asked if there are other ways to fund the extension of infrastructure into the Northeast growth area. Community Development Director Brierley, Public Works Director Hartwig, and Utilities Department Director Cunningham spoke briefly about local bonds, taxes, and assessment districts. City Manager Kuhn noted that tax improvement districts are like assessment districts; there must be value in the land in order to use this funding mechanism. Director Cunningham noted that there is not a lot of grant funding available for infrastructure for new growth areas.

Councilmember Rowlett noted his interest in an “in-between” land use plan that staff should create, analyze, and bring back to the Council.

Councilmember Hunt noted that the area between Vanden Meadows and Southtown on the other side of Fry Road (owned by A & P Children’s Investment) should be analyzed for development as part of the Revised Focused Growth land use alternative.

Mayor Hardy stated he is looking for something along the lines of the Option 2 plan with approx. 3,400 units. He believes 1,500 residential units in the East of Leisure Town Road growth area is too few.

Councilmember Harris stated that the GPU process is a process of balancing growth with the quality of life, and this process works. She is in favor of a hybrid of the Option 2 and the Revised Focused growth land use alternative. She believes the Option 2 plan is too robust.

Vice Mayor Mashburn motioned for a map and data for the hybrid plan between the proposed Option 2 Plan and the Focused Growth Alternative plan. This plan should be then be brought back to the Council along with the other plans for further direction.

Councilmember Rowlett seconded the motion, and the Council voted unanimously in support of the motion.
PREFERED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE
EVALUATED BY THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The City of Vacaville
Community Development Department

Land Use Summary for the North East Growth Area

- Residential Units: 1459 Units
- Park: 45.4 Acres
- Commercial General: 169 Acres
- Commercial Highway: 16.6 Acres
- Industrial: 24.4 Acres
- Business Park: 353 Acres
- Technology Park: 285 Acres
- Urban Reserve: 83 Acres

Land Use Summary for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area

- Residential Units: 4680 Units
- Park Acres: 42.8 Acres
- School Acres: 38 Acres
- Private School: 50 Acres
- Neighborhood Commercial Service Commercial: 37.4 Acres
- Service Commercial: 10.4 Acres
FOCUSED GROWTH LAND USE ALTERNATIVE
EVALUATED BY THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The City of Vacaville
Community Development Department

Land Use Summary for the North East Growth Area

- Residential Units: 270 Units
- Neighborhood Park: 4 Acres
- Commercial Highway: 62 Acres
- Commercial Service: 35 Acres
- Industrial Park: 44 Acres
- Technology Park: 63 Acres
- Public Open Space: 19 Acres
- Agriculture: 1033 Acres

Land Use Summary for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area

- Residential Units: 1390 Units
- Commercial Neighborhood: 6 Acres
- Mixed Use: 1 Acres
- Park: 34 Acres
- School: 61 Acres
- Open Space: 40 Acres
- Agriculture: 847 Acres
- Agricultural Buffer: 90 Acres

Residential
- Residential Rural
- Residential Estate
- Residential Golf Course
- Residential Low Density
- Residential Low Medium Density
- Residential Medium Density
- Residential High Density
- Residential Urban High Density
- Residential Manufactured Home Park

Business/Industrial
- Technology Park
- Urban Reserve
- Business Park
- Industrial; Industrial Park

Commercial
- Mixed Use; Mixed Use - Elmira Cap
- Commercial General
- Commercial Neighborhood
- Commercial Service
- Commercial Highway
- Commercial Office
- Professional Office Restriction

Other
- Public/Institutional
- Schools
- Public Park
- Private Recreation
- Public Open Space
- Agriculture
- Agricultural Buffer
- Hillside Agriculture
- Urban Growth Boundary
- City Limits
Land Use Summary for the North East Growth Area

- Residential Units: 270 Units
- Neighborhood Park: 4 Acres
- Commercial Highway: 62 Acres
- Commercial Service: 35 Acres
- Industrial Park: 44 Acres
- Technology Park: 63 Acres
- Public Open Space: 19 Acres
- Urban Reserve: 1033 Acres

Land Use Summary for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area

- Residential Units: 1565 Units
- Community Park: 15.8 Acres
- Neighborhood Park: 27 Acres
- School: 38 Acres
- Private School: 50 Acres
Land Use Summary for the North East Growth Area

- Residential Units: 1459
- Park: 45.4 Acres
- Commercial General: 169 Acres
- Commercial Highway: 24.4 Acres
- Industrial: 353 Acres
- Business Park: 285 Acres
- Technology Park: 83 Acres

Land Use Summary for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area

- Residential Units: 3479
- Park Acres: 34.5 Acres
- School Acres: 27 Acres
- Private School: 50 Acres
- Neighborhood Commercial: 23.8 Acres
- Service Commercial: 10.4 Acres
HYBRID ALTERNATIVE - OBJECTIVES

These objectives are intended to guide the City staff and consultants as they prepare a revised land use diagram for review by the community and the Planning Commission:

1. **Include an amount of land and number of dwelling units in the East of Leisure Town growth area that is roughly halfway between the Revised Option 2 and the Revised Focused Growth alternatives.** The Jepson Ranch Revised Option 2 plan includes approximately 3,350 dwelling units on approximately 1,270 acres in the East of Leisure Town Growth Area and approximately 1,000 units on approximately 484 acres in the Northeast Growth Area. The Revised Focused Growth alternative includes approximately 1,545 dwelling units on approximately 400 acres in the East of Leisure Town Growth Area and approximately 240 high density units on 10 acres in the Northeast Growth Area. This objective would direct staff to prepare a plan that falls in between these two alternatives for the East of Leisure Town area. The objective would also allow staff to consider revision to the Northeast Growth Area, if such a change might allow planning for a number of dwelling units that meets the City Council’s target for the horizon year of the General Plan Update (2035) and if such change helped advance the objectives for facilitating other desired uses for the Northeast area.

2. **Designate land inside UGB not designated for urban use in this General Plan as Urban Reserve.** The Urban Reserve designation is typically applied to relatively large, contiguous, and undeveloped geographic areas where comprehensive planning must occur prior to urbanization. The purpose of assigning the Urban Reserve designation, rather than specific land use designations, is to demonstrate that the City eventually expects urban development in these areas, while also allowing flexibility in planning for these uses in the future. An Urban Reserve land use designation indicates that the affected land is being identified for future planning as an urban area (i.e. is located inside the UGB), but that more detailed assessment of the appropriate land uses and infrastructure requirements may be needed. The Urban Reserve designation would permit the City’s infrastructure planning to proceed for this area pending a final decision by the City on when to seek annexation and development for the area.

   The plan would include certain triggers for when urban reserve land could be converted to urban zoning, such as when a certain amount of time has passed, when a certain amount of development has occurred, or when land development is needed to facilitate extension of public facilities such as Jepson Parkway or utility extension to employment uses.

3. **Retain the ability to secure right-of-way for the Jepson Parkway expansion.** The City is in the design phase and has secured the funding for Phase 1 of the Jepson Parkway (Leisure Town Road widening) project from the southern City limit to Commerce Way. Construction is anticipated to begin on this phase of the project in 2015. Eventual widening of Leisure Town Road north of Commerce Way is a critical component of the City’s transportation network upgrades. Design work for this second
phase of the Jepson Parkway is anticipated to begin soon but the construction timing is not certain at this point. The General Plan should identify a process for securing the land needed for this project. If development planning for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area would facilitate acquisition of needed right-of-way, a Hybrid Alternative could identify and seek to encourage this infrastructure item.

4. **Retain the ability to extend utilities to attract major employment uses to the Northeast Growth Area.** An objective of the General Plan Update is to encourage major employment center development along I-80 in the Northeast Growth Area. One constraint to this development is the cost and physical difficulty of extending utility infrastructure to this area (Attachment 7b, Utility Maps for New Growth Areas). The preliminary analysis conducted for the General Plan Update confirmed that extensions of these utilities are a major expense that would place a burden on new development (Attachment 7c, Summary of Infrastructure Fiscal Analysis prepared for General Plan Update). The hybrid alternative should retain the ability to extend utilities to attract employment uses to the Northeast Growth Area.

5. **Provide for flexibility in design in the Northeast Growth Area, and provide that residential uses in the Northeast Growth Area would occur after major employment uses.** Proposed Objective 1 indicates that a goal for the East of Leisure Town Road area will be to reduce the number of dwelling units shown on the land use diagram. The PLUA for the Northeast Growth Area also includes approximately 1,400 dwelling units that may not be feasible within the horizon year. Even if feasible, these units may be more appropriately encouraged in the East of Leisure Town area, to provide for the number of anticipated dwelling units believed to be economically realistic over the horizon year growth period. In addition, the layout of zoning in the PLUA for the Northeast growth area could actually deter employment uses if not developed in the proper sequence. For example, as laid out, some of the industrial traffic would need to travel through residential neighborhoods. The revised alternative would require specific plans before the final zoning is set, and would require sequencing of employment uses first.

6. **Encourage and facilitate high quality design for neighborhoods, including amenities.** This objective would direct staff to carefully review the existing land use plan and the associated policies in the draft General Plan. The objective would be to ensure that a Hybrid Alternative contains an appropriate mix of land uses and development policies to ensure that new neighborhoods in both Growth Areas contain the amenities and land use mix that would create high quality new residential areas for the community.

7. **Make efficient use of the planning and environmental analysis prepared for the General Plan Update.** This objective would direct that a final revised plan diagram consider the analysis prepared for the General Plan Update environmental and planning studies and use that analysis to the greatest extent feasible.
ATTACHMENT 7b.1

CITY OF VACAVILLE
VACAVILLE GENERAL PLAN
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES ELEMENT

PLANNED WATER LINES (CITY)
PLANNED WELLS/PLANTS (CITY)
PLANNED RESERVOIRS (CITY)
PLANNED BOOSTER PUMP STATIONS (CITY)

PLANNED WATER LINES (DEVELOPER)
PLANNED RESERVOIRS (DEVELOPER)
PLANNED BOOSTER PUMP STATIONS (DEVELOPER)
WATER LINES UNDER DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION (CITY)


FIGURE PUB-4

YEAR 2035 PLANNED WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS
Notes: 1. WWTP = Wastewater Treatment Plant
2. LS = Lift Station
3. The modeled gravity sewer lines consist of all trunk sewers 12 inches in diameter and greater, plus selected smaller diameter sewers in key areas.
4. Alignment, identification, and sizing of improvements subject to change through periodic Master Planning activities.
In 2011, as part of the General Plan Update process, three land use alternatives were created and evaluated to assist Vacaville residents, business owners, and decision-makers in developing a preferred land use alternative for the city. A key tool in the land use alternatives phase was the Alternatives Evaluation Workbook and its appendices. The Alternatives Evaluation Workbook, published September 8, 2011, provided information that was considered and discussed at a series of public meetings from September through December 2011, which culminated City Council direction on a preferred Land Use Alternative that served as the basis for the Draft General Plan and the analysis in the Draft General Plan EIR.

This document includes excerpts from Appendix A of the Alternatives Evaluation Workbook related to the infrastructure cost and burdens analysis. Excerpts include the analyses for Alternative A, the Focused Growth Alternative, and Alternative C, the Traditional Suburban Alternative. The Focused Growth Alternative has been suggested for adoption as the General Plan land use map because the Draft EIR identifies it as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Traditional Suburban Alternative is most similar to the Preferred Land Use Alternative that was ultimately approved by the City Council in December 2011.

A. Infrastructure Cost and Burdens Methodology

This section provides the methodology and detailed background information for the infrastructure cost and burdens evaluation. This information is provided for background and context for the infrastructure cost and burdens evaluations described below.

This evaluation only considers the backbone infrastructure costs of development. Backbone infrastructure includes major infrastructure improvements for water, sewer, stormwater, and roadway systems that are necessary to create functional systems that new development in the Growth Areas can tie into. These backbone infrastructure costs do not include infrastructure that would be constructed within individual subdivisions or commercial areas that are developed within the Growth Areas (i.e. “in-tract” infrastructure). These costs do not represent the total costs of improvements that would be necessitated by the development in the Growth Areas. For example, these costs do not include any necessary expansions to water or sewer treatment plant capacities. Additional regional freeway improvements may also be required. Development in the Growth Areas...
Areas would be required to contribute its fair share towards the cost of other citywide or regional improvements not adjacent to the Growth Areas. The items included in the backbone infrastructure improvements are detailed in the individual infrastructure analyses that are included in this Appendix.

Although the cost estimates do not represent the total infrastructure costs necessary to serve new development in the Growth Areas as noted above, the items included in the cost estimates are consistent between the Growth Areas and the different alternatives to provide a basis for comparison of cost burdens among them. To facilitate a comparison of the infrastructure cost implications for the different Growth Areas and the different alternatives, the infrastructure cost and burdens sections provides a summary of the infrastructure costs per housing unit and infrastructure costs per square foot of non-residential development, allocating costs among the different land uses according to their contribution to the overall demand for each infrastructure type.

A definitive conclusion regarding development feasibility is not possible based only on backbone infrastructure cost burdens. Ultimately, feasibility is dependent upon the total cost to develop a project in comparison to the value of the project once it is completed. Without studying all of the variables that factor into that equation, a comparison of backbone infrastructure costs to an industry norm can help to gauge potential feasibility. For the purposes of this alternatives evaluation, it is assumed that the new development would adopt the approach of utilizing a Mello-Roos special tax district to finance the installation of the backbone infrastructure. The approach taken to evaluate feasibility is to compare the backbone infrastructure cost for a given alternative to the targeted maximum amount of Mello-Roos bond debt that could be supported by the value of the completed development. For this evaluation, the analysis is based on a single-family home; however, the results will be generally indicative for all land uses.

According to Zillow.com,\(^1\) a website that provides real estate information, the median sale price of all homes sold in Vacaville in June 2011 was $232,800. This was down from a median that peaked at $471,600 in November of 2005. Since the median reflects primarily re-sales of previously occupied homes sold during this period of continuing housing market distress, and this analysis deals with homes that will be newly constructed, most likely when there has been some recovery in the economy and in particular in the housing market, this analysis assumes a completed home value that is $350,000.

\(^1\) Zillow.com is a website that provides real estate information. The website’s data on actual housing sales prices is known to be reliable.
Although this figure may be aggressive, as discussed below, it provides a starting point for the analysis.

According to industry practice, the total annual special tax and assessment burden placed on a home should ideally not be more than 0.5 percent. At levels beyond 0.5 percent, the annual tax burden on homeowners can become onerous, particularly if compared to other homes in the same market where the special tax and assessment burden is noticeably less. Based a presumed interest rate of 5.5 percent annually for a 30-year bond, the special tax debt that should be placed on a home valued at $350,000, in order to have debt service that does not exceed 0.5 percent of the property value, is approximately $25,000\(^2\). While it is possible that a developer would have other means to pay for public improvements other than using Mello-Roos financing, it should also be noted that in addition to backbone infrastructure costs, the developer would need to finance numerous other expenses as part of the land development process, including costs for schools, parks, and other public facilities. Further, the annual special tax and/or assessment capacity may need to leave room for payment of annual costs for certain public services that are funded outside of the City’s General Fund.

A debt service that does not exceed 0.5 percent of the typical property value, or $25,000, can serve as a benchmark value for the backbone infrastructure cost per single-family unit that is viable; however, this benchmark is not an absolute indicator of infrastructure feasibility. For alternatives where the cost would be significantly above $25,000 per single-family unit, it can be expected that development would face significant hurdles to financial feasibility, because the backbone infrastructure costs would consume most if not all of the project’s special tax capacity, limiting the ability to use that financing technique for other necessary project costs. Although the financial relationships between backbone infrastructure costs and value of the completed projects will vary among the different land uses, the infrastructure burden for single-family homes provides a general indicator of the infrastructure feasibility for the range of land uses in a given alternative. If the single-family residential tax burden for a given alternative is above 0.5 percent, then it tends to be over 0.5 percent for the other land uses in that same alternative. As the special tax burden approaches 1.0 percent or more for a given alternative, development would face significant hurdles to financial feasibility.

\(^2\) Note that there has been very little in the way of recent bond activity for land development and it will likely be some time before any bonds would be issued for development in the Growth Areas, so it is difficult to estimate an interest rate. A rate of 5.5 percent would put the interest cost near historic lows; to the extent that bonds could be issued in an environment when interest rates would be higher, the ability to finance infrastructure costs would be reduced. Note also that at 5.5 percent, the net bond proceeds available to fund infrastructure improvements would be less than $25,000, due to the need to set aside funds for expenses such as district formation, and capitalized interest payments.
alternative, the tax burden for other land uses in that alternative tend to also approach 1.0 percent or more, demonstrating that the single-family home indicator is appropriate for other land uses.\(^3\)

\section*{B. Comparison Summary Table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\hline
Alternative & Water & Wastewater & Stormwater & Transportation & Total \\
\hline
\multicolumn{6}{c}{East of Leisure Town Growth Area (in Millions)} \\
A & $4.1$ & $2.3$ & $17.8$ & $31.5$ & $55.7$ \\
C & $8.6$ & $11.6$ & $54.5$ & $78.9$ & $153.6$ \\
\hline
\multicolumn{6}{c}{Northeast Growth Area (in Millions)} \\
A & $3.3$ & $9.8$ & $6.4$ & $21.7$ & $41.1$ \\
C & $15.2$ & $49.7$ & $53.9$ & $214.4$ & $333.3$ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\(^3\) Based on assumed value of $200,000 per unit for multifamily units, $250 per square foot for commercial and office property, and $150 per square foot for industrial property.
C. East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area

1. Alternative A

Total backbone infrastructure costs for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area at buildout are estimated at $56 million. Of this, roadway infrastructure needs represent the largest component, at $31 million, followed by stormwater needs, at $18 million.

i. Preliminary Infrastructure Cost Burden Calculations

The backbone infrastructure cost burden for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area under Alternative A would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Growth Area Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>$43,004 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>$26,362 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$28.11 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$24.78 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$19.75 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the East of Leisure Town Growth Area, Alternative A would have the highest per unit backbone infrastructure cost burden of the three alternatives because it spreads the costs of necessary new infrastructure across a smaller amount of development. The cost per unit for a given type of development (e.g. single-family unit or square foot of commercial space) would translate to about 34 percent higher than costs under Alternative C, and about 45 percent higher than under Alternative B. Costs would also be about 70 percent higher than the costs for the Northeast Area under Alternative A.

At $43,004 per single-family unit, the infrastructure cost burden for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area is well above the targeted threshold of $25,000 per unit, indicating that infrastructure feasibility is poor for this alternative. Although backbone infrastructure costs for all of the alternatives for both the East of Leisure Town and Northeast Growth Areas are estimated at more than $25,000, this alternative has one of the highest burdens, indicating that its viability would be among the most heavily impacted by infrastructure requirements.
ii. **Costs of Development Anticipated by 2035**

As indicated in Appendix B, the amount of development anticipated to be absorbed in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area by 2035 is essentially the same as buildout of the area; however, due to differences in the background traffic conditions between the buildout timeframe and the 2035 timeframe, fewer traffic improvements would need to be constructed, and thus the infrastructure cost burden through 2035 would be reduced to $37,623 per single-family unit, from $43,004 at buildout. 2035 infrastructure costs for other land uses would also be reduced commensurately. Even at the reduced 2035 cost burden levels, the cost burden would still be well above the benchmark targeted for feasibility.

2. **Alternative C**

Backbone infrastructure costs for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area under Alternative C are estimated at approximately $154 million, with roads ($79 million) and stormwater ($55 million) accounting for the vast majority of costs.

i. **Preliminary Infrastructure Cost Burden Calculations**

The backbone infrastructure cost burden for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area under Alternative C would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Growth Area Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>$31,889 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>$19,889 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$21.39 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$19.12 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$15.28 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the per unit infrastructure cost burden for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area is slightly higher in Alternative C than in Alternative B, the cost burden is significantly lower than in Alternative A because the costs of necessary new infrastructure are spread across a larger amount of development. Also, in Alternative C, the per unit cost burdens for development in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area would be substantially less than the cost burdens for growth in the Northeast Growth Area in Alternative C.
At $31,889 per single-family unit, the cost burden exceeds the targeted benchmark of $25,000 per unit, indicating likely challenges to financing feasibility. Along with Alternative B for the East of Leisure Town Growth Area, this alternative is closest to the benchmark, indicating that there may be some potential for a carefully crafted financing strategy to overcome the costs; however, absent additional information and analysis, feasibility is questionable.

\[ \text{\textit{ii. Costs of Development Anticipated by 2035}} \]

Only a relatively small portion of the total allowed development would be expected to occur by 2035; therefore, infrastructure cost allocations to this area would also be reduced. The result is that development in the East of Leisure Town Growth Area through 2035 might have slightly lower infrastructure cost burdens than development in this Growth Area through full buildout; however, any reductions would likely be minimal, and this would not likely create significant improvements in infrastructure financing feasibility.

\[ \text{\textit{D. Northeast Growth Area}} \]

1. Alternative A

Backbone infrastructure costs for the Northeast Growth Area under Alternative A are estimated at approximately $41 million. Roads represent the largest component of these costs, at $22 million, followed by wastewater, at $10 million.

\[ \text{\textit{i. Preliminary Infrastructure Cost Burden Calculations}} \]

The backbone infrastructure cost burden for the Northeast Growth Area under Alternative A would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Growth Area Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>$25,349 per unit(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>$17,449 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$14.54 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{4}\text{Although this alternative does not include single-family homes in its development program, the cost burden for a single-family home, if it were included in the alternative, is shown here for the purposes of comparison to the benchmark infrastructure financing feasibility threshold. For further information, see Section A.}\]
Office $12.47 per sq. ft.
Industrial $9.57 per sq. ft.

The per unit cost burdens for new development under Alternative A are the least among the three alternatives for the Northeast Growth Area because the overall infrastructure needs are the least. In addition, the per unit cost burdens for the Northeast Growth Area under Alternative A are significantly less than the cost burdens for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area under Alternative A.

The $25,349 cost burden estimated for a single-family home only slightly exceeds the targeted benchmark of $25,000. This suggests that a creative financing strategy may be able to feasibly incorporate these infrastructure costs; however, overall feasibility for this alternative will be dependent upon other yet-to-be determined costs for infrastructure and public improvements.

Because this alternative does not actually include single-family units in its development mix and is relatively heavily weighted towards non-residential development compared to the East of Leisure Town Road alternatives, it is also useful to note that annual special tax burdens for backbone infrastructure for multi-family units would be above the targeted maximum special tax burden of 0.5 percent, but that the annual special tax burdens for non-residential land uses would be below the 0.5 percent threshold, based on the Mello-Roos financing parameters described in Section A. This suggests that it may be possible for a creative financing strategy to feasibly incorporate the infrastructure costs; however, overall feasibility for this alternative will depend upon the magnitude of costs for other items that are not included in the cost estimates reflected here.

ii. Costs of Development Anticipated by 2035
Under Alternative A, the Northeast Area would be expected to absorb all 270 multifamily housing units, about three fourths of the industrial space, and about 10 percent of the commercial space that it could accommodate at buildout. With this lower amount of development to support costs through 2035, but only marginally reduced infrastructure costs, the cost burdens would be even greater than under the full buildout scenario and, therefore, less viable.
2. **Alternative C**

At $333 million, estimated backbone infrastructure costs for the Northeast Growth Area under Alternative C are almost four times the infrastructure costs of the Alternative B. Roadways, at $214 million, represent the largest cost component, while stormwater ($54 million) and wastewater ($50 million) also represent major cost components.

### i. Preliminary Infrastructure Cost Burden Calculations

The backbone infrastructure cost burden for the Northeast Growth Area under Alternative C would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Growth Area Cost Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>$50,714 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>$33,464 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$29.20 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$24.11 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$18.32 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The per unit cost burden for development in the Northeast Growth Area under Alternative C would be the highest of the cost burdens for any of the Northeast Growth Area alternatives because of the extent of infrastructure needs to serve the development. In addition, Northeast Growth Area per unit cost burdens under Alternative C would be about 60 percent greater than the cost burdens for new development in the East of Leisure Town Growth Area under Alternative C, and greater than under any of the other East of Leisure Town Growth Area alternatives.

The estimated infrastructure cost burden of $50,714 per single-family unit is about double the targeted infrastructure feasibility benchmark of $25,000 per unit. Absent additional information about the cost and financing structure for the remainder of the project costs, feasibility for this alternative should be considered poor.

Because this alternative is relatively heavily weighted towards non-residential development compared to the East of Leisure Town Road alternatives, it is also useful to note that annual special tax burdens for backbone infrastructure for all the other land use cat-
egories in this alternative would also be at or above the targeted maximum special tax burden of 0.5 percent, based on the Mello-Roos financing parameters described in Section A.

ii. **Costs of Development Anticipated by 2035**
Only a small amount of new development would be anticipated in the Northeast Growth Area by 2035, yet this small amount of new development would trigger the need for extensive infrastructure investments to serve the area. As a result, infrastructure cost burdens through 2035 would be exponentially greater than those projected for buildout of this alternative, likely eclipsing the total potential value of the completed development. Development under this scenario would not be viable.
1 Work Scope

This document describes the scope of services to be completed by the PlaceWorks team to complete the revisions to and adoption of the Vacaville General Plan, including changes to the land use map within the East of Leisure Town Road and Northeast Growth Areas. To facilitate your review of this proposal, we have prepared a concise scope that emphasizes key components of our approach to this project. We will work with you to prepare a more detailed scope when we enter into a contract.

The PlaceWorks team would complete the following steps:

A. January 13 Council Meeting

PlaceWorks will assist with staff report preparation, creating a presentation, and attending the meeting.

B. Stakeholder Meetings

PlaceWorks will consult with City staff, as appropriate, before and after stakeholder meetings conducted by staff in order to discuss concerns and build consensus around a revised land use map for the two Growth Areas that reflects the parameters defined by the City Council. PlaceWorks would not attend the meetings.

C. Refined Land Use Map and Buildout Estimates

PlaceWorks will prepare a draft revised land use map, in GIS, for review and comment by City staff. PlaceWorks will refine the land use map based on City staff comments in preparation for consideration by the City Council.

Using consistent methodology as utilized for the Draft General Plan EIR, PlaceWorks will identify the amount of residential and commercial growth that would occur under the revised land use map. Residential growth will be expressed as the number of units for different housing types (e.g. single-family, multi-family). Non-residential growth will be described as the total square feet for different commercial uses such as office, retail and industrial. PlaceWorks will also estimate the number of new residents and new jobs under the revised land use map.

This scope assumes up to three rounds of revision to the land use map and resulting buildout calculations as the Council and community discuss and offer feedback on the draft map.
When deemed appropriate by staff and City Council, PlaceWorks will provide the land use map and buildout estimates to the technical team for use in Task D.

D. Feasibility and Cost Analysis of Revised Land Use Map

The PlaceWorks team will prepare a feasibility and cost analysis of one revised land use map. The analysis is intended to provide information on the connection between development and infrastructure in the two Growth Areas. This analysis will be structured to allow comparison with the infrastructure burdens identified in 2011 as part of the General Plan land use alternatives evaluation. By examining the infrastructure burden of the revised “Option 3” land use map in relation to the infrastructure burdens identified in 2011, it will be possible to gain an understanding of the impact of changing the proposed unit counts on the infrastructure cost burden levels.

This scope refers to “Option 3,” the current term for a map that allows an amount and extent of development somewhere between the low end represented by the Focused Growth Alternative, and the high end represented by the “Option 2” plan proposed by the Jepson Ranch landowners group and presented to the Council on October 28, 2014. However, this analysis could be performed on any one land use map with the same approach, and same cost, described below. Note that this scope assumes that changes from previous land use maps will be limited to the East of Leisure Town and Northeast Growth Areas.

1. Sewer and Storm Drain
   a. Infrastructure and Cost Analysis
      West Yost Associates will assess backbone sanitary sewer and drainage infrastructure necessary to serve a General Plan land use alternative. The analysis will be at a similar level of detail as conducted for the original alternatives evaluation, except that to the extent possible we will rely on the previous work to reach our conclusions.

      For the sanitary sewer and drainage utilities, West Yost will prepare (similar to previous analysis for the Alternatives Evaluation Workbook):

      a) A brief memorandum summarizing the assumptions to be used in the analysis;
      b) A figure showing the backbone infrastructure evaluated, including conceptual alignments and sizing; and
      c) A table summarizing a planning level estimate of facilities project costs.
b. Northeast Growth Area Sewer Alignment
West Yost Associates will lay out a conceptual alignment for a direct sewer line to the Northeast Growth Area and estimate flows, size facilities, and estimate planning-level costs. West Yost will also prepare a figure showing the alignment and prepare brief text to include in a memorandum documenting the assumptions associated with the analysis.

2. Roadways
The cost analysis for the proposed General Plan “Option 3” circulation system will be completed in two phases. The preliminary analysis, to be completed prior to Planning Commission consideration in March 2014, will use available analysis results to the extent possible, selecting more conservative assumptions from prior studies where updated analysis is not yet available. The full analysis, to be completed prior to City Council consideration, will update the analysis to verify the findings from the preliminary analysis or potentially update the circulation requirements based on the revised General Plan buildout land uses.

a. Preliminary Circulation Assessment
The preliminary circulation assessment will be based on the assumption that the “Option 3” buildout land uses will be virtually identical to the current draft General Plan in every geographic area except for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. Therefore, the preliminary assessment will rely on prior analysis of General Plan buildout to determine infrastructure requirements outside of the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. Within the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area, the required circulation improvements will be updated based on the access requirements of the proposed “Option 3” land use plan as well as a qualitative assessment of the relative trip generation potential of the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area (presumed to be less than the current proposed General Plan).

Preliminary planning-level cost estimates for the 2035 horizon year and Buildout (beyond 2035) will be prepared using the methodology consistent with the methodology used for the transportation costs in the 2011 Alternatives Evaluation Workbook. The initial estimates will use the same unit costs as those used in 2011 for consistency. KAI will research recent changes in road construction costs to identify whether road improvement costs have changed at a different rate than the general rate of inflation. The cost estimates will be transmitted to the City’s economic consultant.
b. Full Circulation Assessment
The full circulation assessment will update the quantitative trip generation and traffic forecasts for both the 2035 horizon year used for the environmental assessment as well as Buildout (beyond 2035) conditions used to determine ultimate right-of-way reservation requirements. The preliminary assessment should provide good information on the infrastructure required within the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area, but may provide a conservative estimate of infrastructure in other areas of the city if the “Option 3” land uses would have fewer regional impacts on the Vacaville street system. The full circulation assessment is intended to verify whether other citywide circulation improvement requirements can be modified outside the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area due to revised land uses in the proposed “Option 3.”

i. Traffic Forecast Update
KAI will receive land use quantities by TAZ for the proposed General Plan “Option 3”, both for 2035 horizon year and buildout scenarios. The land uses will be converted to the format used as input to the Vacaville travel model. The travel model will be run to generate 2035 and Buildout traffic forecasts for the AM and PM peak hours.

The 2035 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes will be compared to the prior model forecasts for the proposed General Plan as evaluated in the Draft EIR. A volume difference map will be prepared for each peak hour.

The Buildout AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes will be compared to the traffic forecasts from the Alternatives Workbook for the most comparable General Plan alternative. Volume difference maps will be prepared to help identify locations where the revised General Plan Option 3 may require different levels of infrastructure than previously assumed in the draft General Plan.

ii. Circulation Improvement Requirements
The 2035 volume differences will be evaluated to determine if any changes in recommended 2035 improvements will be required. At this time, it is assumed that 2035 changes will not be required other than specific local street connections within the East of Leisure Town growth area.

The Buildout traffic forecasts will be compared to segment capacities to identify segments that are projected to exceed the proposed General Plan level of service thresholds. This analysis will be based on the ratio of traffic volume to average segment capacity (methodology consistent with the evaluation for the Alternatives
Workbook), with a volume/capacity ratio of 0.85 used to represent “mid LOS D” conditions, consistent with the LOS policy in the Draft General Plan (a threshold of LOS D and V/C of 0.90 was used during the preparation of the Alternatives Workbook because the City had not yet decided upon its LOS policy).

The identified segments will be compared with those identified as deficient for the draft General Plan. Differences in recommended road improvements and right-of-way reservation for buildout conditions will be summarized and submitted to PlaceWorks and City staff for review. This list will be verified with City staff, along with recommendations for potential improvements to freeway segments and freeway interchanges. The updated recommendations for right-of-way reservation will be revised based on comments and used to update the appropriate General Plan figures. As part of the review and revisions, KAI may code the recommended improvements into the travel model and run a new “mitigated” forecast in order to verify the effectiveness of the proposed Buildout street widths.

iii. Cost Estimates

The planning-level cost estimates for 2035 and Buildout will be updated based on the full circulation assessment and transmitted to the City’s economic consultant.

3. Water

NV5 (formerly known as Nolte) will conduct a peer review of the land use map and document the consistencies with the previous master planning effort completed in June 2011. PlaceWorks and the City Utilities Department will make available all the necessary documentation (e.g. exhibits and data) necessary for this analysis. The previous master planning documents that will be used in this analysis are:

♦ June 20, 2011 Technical Memorandum – Draft Growth Areas Land Use Alternatives Preliminary Analysis
♦ City of Vacaville Water Master Plan (1990)
♦ City of Vacaville Urban Water Management Plan (2010)
♦ Solano Irrigation District (SID) Master Water Agreement (1995) and 2000 Amendment
a. Water Demand Update and Water Supply and Distribution Requirements
NV5 will evaluate the impacts of the proposed land use map as it relates to the water supply and distribution system. The analysis, summary, and findings will be submitted to PlaceWorks and the City in the form of a technical memorandum. NV5 will participate in up to three (3) conference calls with PlaceWorks and with City staff to receive and review comments and input on the impacts analysis.

NV5 will use the hydraulic model confirmed under a separate contract in 2011 with the City Utilities Department in this impacts analysis. Updates to the model are not included as part of this scope. This scope only includes the necessary updates to the model to revise the water demands and executing steady state simulations to confirm impacts. Model calibration and extended period simulations are not anticipated as part of this analysis.

b. Cost Estimates
NV5 will prepare preliminary infrastructure cost estimates for the recommended backbone water distribution system infrastructure improvements for the land use map using 2011 dollars. This will allow for comparisons made with the cost analysis in the Alternatives Evaluation Workbook. Estimates will include water distribution/transmission mains into the proposed Growth Areas. The estimates will separate projects already covered by the City’s existing development impact fee from other projects needed at buildout of the updated General Plan. The cost estimates will be submitted to the General Plan economist in the form of a technical memorandum as part of the alternative analysis TM.

4. Preliminary Infrastructure Cost Evaluation and Financing Viability
Using the buildout information provided by PlaceWorks, and the cost information provided by West Yost, Kittelson, and NV5 in Tasks D.1, D.2, and D.3, BAE will prepare preliminary impact fee calculations to determine the approximate impact fee levels that would need to be charged to new development in the Growth Areas in order to offset the cost of the required improvements. BAE will prepare a draft cost evaluation memo that presents the growth assumptions, the capital facilities requirements, and the preliminary fee calculations for each urban growth area. BAE’s analysis will include an assessment of whether the preliminary fee burdens appear viable, recognizing that in addition to fees specific to the individual urban growth areas, the new development would be responsible to pay various other citywide fees, school fees, etc. In addition to comparing the resulting infrastructure cost burden for the Option 3 land use alternative with the findings from the 2011 Alternatives Evaluation Workbook analysis, BAE will estimate the current market pricing for single-family homes and determine whether changes in market prices
for single-family homes since 2011 justify utilizing a different infrastructure cost burden threshold as an indicator of feasibility.

BAE staff will be available to discuss the draft memo with City staff and staff from PlaceWorks. Upon receipt of a single consolidated set of comments on the draft memo, BAE will prepare a final memo for the City’s use. The budget for this task includes time for BAE to coordinate with City staff, PlaceWorks, Kittelson, NV5, and West Yost in order to obtain the information needed to conduct the evaluation. The budget for this task also includes time for BAE to update the analysis with updated and/or refined costs from West Yost, Kittelson, and/or NV5, if needed based on additional analysis after the preliminary assessment prepared for the March 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

The budget for this task assumes that the infrastructure cost estimates will be in the same format and cover the same items as those provided to BAE for the 2011 analysis and that BAE will not need to update any of the service demand factors used to allocate costs in the 2011 analysis.

a. Pro-Forma Feasibility Analysis (Optional)
As an optional task to augment the findings from Task D.4, BAE can prepare a financial feasibility pro-forma model, to test the feasibility of developing single-family housing units (the predominant development type included in the land use alternative East of Leisure Town Road), considering not only the backbone infrastructure cost burden, but other soft costs and hard costs as well. The pro-forma model will consider the cost to develop a prototypical single-family unit, and compare those costs to the expected developer returns on sale, to determine whether the project could be feasibly developed. To assist with this task, BAE will request from City staff an estimate of the applicable City planning and building permit fees for a typical single-family housing unit. BAE will utilize some information from a multifamily housing feasibility analysis previously prepared for the City of Vacaville; however, extensive updates will be necessary due to the differences between single-family and multifamily homes.

The budget for this optional task also includes time for BAE to update the analysis with updated and/or refined costs from West Yost, Kittelson, and/or NV5, if needed based on additional analysis after the preliminary assessment prepared for the March 2015 Planning Commission meeting.
**E. CEQA Documentation**

In this task, the PlaceWorks team will compare the final land use map supported by Council to the Draft General Plan land use map analyzed in the General Plan EIR to determine the City’s options and obligations relating to CEQA compliance.

1. **Review of Transportation-Related Impacts**

   Kittelson will review potential differences in 2035 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for the Option 3 scenario. At this time, it is assumed that the impacts and mitigation measures in the Draft EIR would still apply to Option 3, or that the impacts of Option 3 would be lesser than those identified in the Draft EIR. If this assumption is true, KAI will prepare a letter to the City stating that the Draft EIR impacts and mitigation measures adequately document the transportation-related impacts of the proposed General Plan Option 3. If there are potential differences in traffic conditions which may affect the documented impacts and mitigation measures, KAI will consult with PlaceWorks and City staff to identify next steps.

2. **EIR Addendum**

   If, after careful review, PlaceWorks and City staff conclude that the impacts of the revised land use map would be the same or less than the impacts already disclosed in the General Plan EIR, then PlaceWorks will prepare a formal Addendum to the General Plan EIR documenting the changes in the revised land use map and explaining for each CEQA topic area why no changes to impacts or mitigation measures would occur.

**F. Revisions to General Plan**

Assuming that the land use map ultimately adopted by the City Council is different from the map contained in the Draft General Plan, the PlaceWorks team will conduct a thorough review of the Draft General Plan to identify background text, policies, actions, and figures that need to be revised to be consistent with the adopted land use map. The PlaceWorks team will provide revisions for City staff review and approval.

**G. Additional Council or Planning Commission Meetings (Optional)**

Joanna Jansen of PlaceWorks will prepare for, attend, and present at additional Planning Commission and City Council meetings, as needed.
H. Ongoing Project Management

This task covers ongoing day-to-day communication with City staff during the time the tasks above are being completed, including, primarily, weekly one-hour calls with City staff to keep the project on track.

2 Schedule

Completion of the Feasibility and Cost Analysis based on the preliminary circulation assessment in Task D can be completed within six weeks after delivery of final land use buildout information to the engineering subconsultants.

3 Cost Estimate

As shown in Table 1, the estimated cost to complete the scope of work described in this proposal is $123,238.

This cost does not include the two optional tasks listed above. Those costs would be:

- D.4.a: Pro Forma: $7,295
- G: Council or Planning Commission Meetings: $1,100 per meeting

We understand that the City has already expended considerable funds on the General Plan Update process. We believe the costs presented are accurate and reasonable based on our understanding of the desired work products, but we are flexible regarding costs for these final tasks and open to discussing them further with City staff.
# Table 1

**PlaceWorks**  
**Contract Amendment 6: Option 3**  
**Cost Estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per Task</th>
<th>PlaceWorks</th>
<th>BAE</th>
<th>Kittelson</th>
<th>West Yost</th>
<th>Nolte</th>
<th>Labor Per Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/13 Council meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine land use map, Buildout</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility and Cost Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,090, $16,940, $22,500, $16,600, $66,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional pro forma analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA: Addendum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions to General Plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,590, $2,500, $2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Council or Planning Cmns Meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Hours                  | 2          | 66  | 114       | 38        | 44    | 14     |
| Billing Rate                 | $225       | $175| $160      | $135      | $105  | $80    |
| Labor Cost                   | $450       | $11,550| $18,240  | $5,130    | $4,620| $1,120 |

Total Firm Labor Cost         | $41,110    | $6,090| $22,830   | $25,000   | $19,560|

**EXPENSES**  
Mileage (@ $0.565 per mile)  | $203       |
Subconsultant Administration (10%) | $7,373   |
Report Production (Phone, Fax, Copies, etc. @ 2% of Labor) | $822, $250 |

Total Expenses                | $8,398     | $250 | $0        | $0        | $0    |

**TOTAL PER FIRM**             | $49,508    | $6,340| $22,830   | $25,000   | $19,560|

GRAND TOTAL                   | $123,238   |

1/6/2015