



City of Woodland

Meeting Agenda - Final

Planning Commission

City of Woodland Planning
Commission
c/o Community
Development Department
300 First Street
Woodland, CA 95695

530-661-5820

Thursday, March 16, 2017

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Please Note: The numerical order of items on this agenda is for convenience of reference; items may be taken out of order. No new items shall begin after 10:30 pm unless unanimous consent exists to continue.

A. Call to Order

B. Roll Call

C. Pledge of Allegiance

D. Staff and Commissioner Comments

This is an opportunity for the Planning Commission members and staff to make comments and announcements to express concerns, or to request Commission's consideration of any items a Commission member would like to have discussed at a future Commission meeting..

E. Subcommittee Reports

F. Communications from the Public

This is an opportunity for the public to speak to the Commission on any item other than those listed for public hearing on the agenda. Speakers are requested to use the microphone in front of the Commission and to begin by stating their name, whether they reside in Woodland and the name of the organization they represent if any. The Commission may impose a time limit on any speaker depending on the number of people wanting to speak and time available for the rest of the agenda. In the event comments are related to an item scheduled on the agenda, speakers may be required to wait to make their comments until that item is considered.

G. Approval of Minutes

[17-0343](#)

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings of January 19, 2017.

Attachments: [A - January 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes](#)

H. Public Hearing

[17-0342](#)

SUBJECT: Adoption of 2035 General Plan and 2035 Climate Action Plan

DATE: March 16, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take action on the following:

1. Receive a staff report;
2. Conduct the public hearing; and
3. Adopt Resolution NO. PC17-01 (Attachment 1) recommending to the City Council:

a. Certification the Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2013032015) (Attachments D and E to the March 2, 2017 staff report) for the 2035 General Plan based on Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be adopted by City Council; and

b. Adoption the final 2035 General Plan (Attachments A, B, and F to the March 2, 2017 staff report) and final 2035 Climate Action Plan (Attachments C and G to the March 2, 2017 staff report).

Copies of all referenced documents can be ordered through the City or accessed online at the following website:

<http://web.cityofwoodland.org/gov/depts/cd/divisions/planning/generalplan/2035/documents.asp>

Attachments: [1 - Resolution PC17-01 - GP Adoption](#)

[2 - Staff Notes 03_02_17 PC Meeting](#)

[3 - Responses to CAP Comments](#)

I. Business Items

Items for Planning Commission discussion and/or action that do not require public hearing.

J. Staff or Commissioner Comments

Continued as needed.

Receive Absence Requests.

K. Adjournment

The Planning Commission of the City of Woodland encourages all parties interested in a matter scheduled to be reviewed, discussed and acted on at a meeting, to participate in the public discourse, which may include the submission of written comments and materials. The Planning Commission notifies the public that those materials received less than 24 hours before a meeting date and time may not be able to be considered completely. Further, the Planning Commission encourages interested parties to attend the meeting to discuss any matter of concern and to explain their comments more fully.



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 17-0343 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Minutes **Status:** Agenda Ready
File created: 3/9/2017 **In control:** Planning Commission
On agenda: 3/16/2017 **Final action:**
Title: SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings of January 19, 2017.

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [A - January 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes](#)

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

Planning Commission Minutes

TO: Members of the Woodland Planning Commission

DATE: March 16, 2017

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings of January 19, 2017.

STAFF CONTACT: Debbie Flemmer, Administrative Clerk, Community Development Department

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A - January 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes



City of Woodland

Meeting Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

City of Woodland Planning
Commission
c/o Community
Development Department
300 First Street
Woodland, CA 95695
530-661-5820

Thursday, January 19, 2017

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

A. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m.

Staff present:

Stephen Coyle, Deputy Director

Cindy Norris, Principal Planner

B. Roll Call

Present 6:

*Chairman Kirby Wells, Vice Chairman Chris Holt, Commissioner Steve Harris,
Commissioner Marco Lizarra, Commissioner Fred Lopez and Commissioner Elodia
Ortega-Lampkin*

Absent 1:

Commissioner John Murphy

C. Pledge of Allegiance

D. Staff and Commissioner Comments

E. Subcommittee Reports

F. Communications from the Public

G. Approval of Minutes

[16-865](#)

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings of October 27, 2016 and November 17, 2016.

Attachments:

[A - October 27, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

[B - November 17, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Harris and seconded by Commissioner

Lizarraga to approve the Planning Commission Meeting minutes of October 27, 2017.

The motion was carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Vice Chairman Holt and Commissioners Harris, Lizarraga, Lopez and Ortega-Lampkin

Abstention: Chairman Wells

A motion was made by Commissioner Lizarraga and seconded by Vice Chairman Holt to approve the Planning Commission Meeting minutes of November 17, 2016.

The motion was carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Vice Chairman Holt and Commissioners Harris, Lizarraga, Lopez and Ortega-Lampkin

Abstention: Chairman Wells

H. Public Hearing

I. Business Items

[17-104](#)

SUBJECT: Election of Officers for Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission

DATE: January 19, 2016

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Hold Elections; and
2. Vote and select among current membership, the appointments of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission

Attachments: [A - Planning Commission Rules and Regulations excerpt.pdf](#)

- *Kirby Wells was nominated to continue serving as Chair of the Commission through September 7, 2017. No other nominations were received. Commissioner Wells was elected to Chair by a majority vote (6-0 with 1 commissioner absent)*
Ayes: Chairman Wells, Vice Chairman Holt and Commissioners Harris, Lizarraga, Lopez and Ortega-Lampkin
- *Chris Holt was nominated to continue serving as Vice-Chair of the Commission through September 7, 2017. No other nominations were received. Commissioner Holt was elected to Vice Chair by majority vote (6-0 with 1 commissioner absent)*
Ayes: Chairman Wells, Vice Chairman Holt and Commissioners Harris, Lizarraga, Lopez and Ortega-Lampkin
- *Appointments to Planning Commission Subcommittees:*
 - o *General Plan Subcommittee (no appointments)*
 - o *Zoning Subcommittee – Vice Chairman Holt, Commissioners Lizarraga and Lopez*
 - o *Public Art Ad-Hock Subcommittee – Chairman Wells, Commissioners Lopez and Murphy*
 - o *Marijuana Ordinance Subcommittee – Commissioners Lizarraga, Lopez and Harris*
 - o *Design Liaison - Chairman Holt*

[17-129](#)

SUBJECT: Initial Review of the Proposed Work Plan to Amend the Downtown Specific Plan

DATE: January 19, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Receive a staff report that provides an initial review concerning the proposed update to the Downtown Specific Plan, and
2. Provide comments and input to help inform the work program and project process

Attachments: [1 - Diagram of the Proposed Amended Chapters to the Downtown Specific Plan](#)
[2 - An Introduction to Form Based Codes](#)

A presentation was provided by Deputy Director Stephen Coyle and public comments were accepted.

[17-126](#)

SUBJECT: Long Range Calendar

Recommendation for Action: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission receive the Long Range Calendar for informational purposes only.

Attachments: [PLANNING COMMISSION LONG RANGE CALENDAR 1.12.17](#)

Cindy Norris provided information.

J. Staff or Commissioner Comments

K. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

The Planning Commission of the City of Woodland encourages all parties interested in a matter scheduled to be reviewed, discussed and acted on at a meeting, to participate in the public discourse, which may include the submission of written comments and materials. The Planning Commission notifies the public that those materials received less than 24 hours before a meeting date and time may not be able to be considered completely. Further, the Planning Commission encourages interested parties to attend the meeting to discuss any matter of concern and to explain their comments more fully.



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 17-0342 Version: 1 Name:
Type: Public Hearing Item Status: Agenda Ready
File created: 3/9/2017 In control: Planning Commission
On agenda: 3/16/2017 Final action:
Title: SUBJECT: Adoption of 2035 General Plan and 2035 Climate Action Plan
DATE: March 16, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take action on the following:

1. Receive a staff report;
2. Conduct the public hearing; and
3. Adopt Resolution NO. PC17-01 (Attachment 1) recommending to the City Council:
 - a. Certification the Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2013032015) (Attachments D and E to the March 2, 2017 staff report) for the 2035 General Plan based on Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be adopted by City Council; and
 - b. Adoption the final 2035 General Plan (Attachments A, B, and F to the March 2, 2017 staff report) and final 2035 Climate Action Plan (Attachments C and G to the March 2, 2017 staff report).

Copies of all referenced documents can be ordered through the City or accessed online at the following website:
<http://web.cityofwoodland.org/gov/depts/cd/divisions/planning/generalplan/2035/documents.asp>

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [1 - Resolution PC17-01 - GP Adoption](#)
[2 - Staff Notes 03_02_17 PC Meeting](#)
[3 - Responses to CAP Comments](#)

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------



City of Woodland

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Woodland Planning Commission

FROM: Ken Hiatt, Assistant City Manager - Community and Economic Development
Cindy A. Norris, Principal Planner
Heidi Tschudin, General Plan Project Manager

SUBJECT: Adoption of 2035 General Plan and 2035 Climate Action Plan

DATE: March 16, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take action on the following:

1. Receive a staff report;
2. Conduct the public hearing; and
3. Adopt Resolution NO. PC17-01 (Attachment 1) recommending to the City Council:
 - a. Certification the Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2013032015) (Attachments D and E to the March 2, 2017 staff report) for the 2035 General Plan based on Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be adopted by City Council; and
 - b. Adoption the final 2035 General Plan (Attachments A, B, and F to the March 2, 2017 staff report) and final 2035 Climate Action Plan (Attachments C and G to the March 2, 2017 staff report).

Copies of all referenced documents can be ordered through the City or accessed online at the following website:
<http://web.cityofwoodland.org/gov/depts/cd/divisions/planning/generalplan/2035/documents.asp>

PURPOSE OF MEETING:

The purpose of this second of two hearings before the Planning Commission is to receive the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council regarding final action on the 2035 General Plan and 2035 Climate Action Plan (CAP).

The Planning Commission is being asked to recommend to the City Council that they certify the EIR (Attachments D and E to the March 2, 2017 staff report)), adopt the final 2035 General Plan comprised of the Public Review Draft released in July 2017 including subsequent changes recommended by staff (Attachments A, B, and F to the March 2, 2017 staff report), and adopt the final 2035 CAP comprised of the Draft CAP released in September 2016 and subsequent changes recommended by staff (Attachments C and G to the March 2, 2017 staff report).

MARCH 2, 2017 HEARING

The Planning Commission conducted the first of two public hearings on the General Plan and CAP on March 2, 2017. At that meeting, City staff and the General Plan team provided a comprehensive overview of the EIR, General Plan, and Climate Action Plan. Staff and consultants responded to questions of the Planning Commission as reflected in the record. Meeting notes are provided in Attachment 2. The public hearing was opened and testimony was received from four speakers. In response to an inquiry from one speaker, the responses to comments received on the Draft CAP are provided in Attachment 3 through a modified format, similar to the format used for the General Plan comments. The public hearing was closed and the Planning Commission adjourned following general comments.

The following correspondence was submitted to the Planning Commission for their consideration at the March 2, 2017 hearing:

Letter dated March 1, 2017 from Robert Beggs of Brown and Caldwell on behalf of Pacific Coast Producers (PCP) related to soils on the City's 900-acre property under lease to PCP for tomato processing wastewater irrigation reuse.

Letter dated February 28, 2017 from Timothy Taron of Hefner Law on behalf of Eastland Ventures, LLC related to the soils on the City's 900-acre property under lease to PCP for tomato processing wastewater irrigation reuse.

In response to these letters and related questions from the Planning Commission, the staff made the following points at the hearing:

- The City used the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) maps to analyze the soil for the entirety of the Planning Area. Use of these maps is consistent with the standards of significance set forth in the CEQA Guidelines, which focuses on whether the proposed project would convert farmland pursuant to the FMMP maps. Using the FMMP maps ensured consistency in the analysis throughout the EIR and complied with the specific requirements of CEQA.
- This information received from Hefner Law is premature in that it is site-specific and potentially project-specific in advance of any application or proposal for change in land use on the City's property. The condition of the soils at this property may change. In addition, the information from Hefner Law has not been peer reviewed, and the qualifications of the Hefner consultant to render an expert opinion in this subject matter have not been substantiated.
- Experts often disagree over the content and analysis of an EIR. The purpose of an EIR is to provide information to decision-makers that allows them to make a decision that takes accounts of environmental consequences. The courts review EIRs for adequacy and a good faith attempt at disclosing those environmental consequences. Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines make clear that disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate (15151).
- The two submitted letters are part of the record and will be pertinent for future consideration at such time as other uses on the property are contemplated. Staff does not recommend changing the mapping characteristics of this site and create an inconsistency with the state farmland mapping data or the prior conditions of the site in advance of additional analysis and consideration that would be premature at this time.
- The General Plan is composed of a community vision and guiding principles that are articulated in a set of goals and policies throughout the elements in the Plan. These goals and policies reflect the wide range of community values that must be considered and balanced. They are built upon a legacy of community planning documents and decisions. Further, state law provides that all elements of the General Plan carry equal weight. Consideration of one policy over others without balanced consideration could jeopardize the ability of the city to realize its core goals. As a result, it is recommended that each possible future development application be evaluated in a holistic manner, consisting of appropriate detailed project level analysis as well as an assessment of the project's realization of all General Plan goals and policies.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take action on the following:

4. Receive a staff report;
5. Conduct the public hearing; and
6. Adopt Resolution NO. PC17-01 (Attachment 1) recommending to the City Council:
 - a. Certification the Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2013032015) (Attachments D and E to the March 2, 2017 staff report) for the 2035 General Plan based on Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be adopted by City Council; and
 - b. Adoption the final 2035 General Plan (Attachments A, B, and F to the March 2, 2017 staff report) and final 2035 Climate Action Plan (Attachments C and G to the March 2, 2017 staff report).

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 - Resolution PC 17-01 of the Planning Commission of the City of Woodland Recommending to the City Council Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2035 General Plan and 2035 Climate Action Plan (SCH #2013032015) and Approval of the 2035 General Plan and the 2035 Climate Action Plan for the City of Woodland.

Attachment 2 - Staff notes from the March 2, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting

Attachment 3 - Responses to CAP Comments

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 17-01

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF
WOODLAND RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL
CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT FOR THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN AND 2035 CLIMATE
ACTION PLAN (SCH #2013032015) AND APPROVAL OF THE 2035
GENERAL PLAN AND THE 2035 CLIMATE ACTION PLAN FOR THE
CITY OF WOODLAND**

WHEREAS, in early 2013, the City initiated the process of updating the General Plan by approving a work plan and schedule, appointing a citizen steering committee, undertaking public meetings, and conducting public workshops; and

WHEREAS, in conformance with Government Code Section 65300, the City of Woodland commenced a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan; and

WHEREAS, in the spring of 2013, the General Plan vision was developed; in the spring and fall of 2013, the Housing Element was prepared and background research and analysis for the other elements were undertaken; in the winter of 2013 and the spring of 2014, draft development scenarios and initial policy framework was developed; in the summer through winter of 2014, analysis and testing of the development scenarios was conducted and the Climate Action Plan was drafted; in the spring through fall of 2015, the preliminary plan was developed and the policy framework was refined in the winter of 2015 through the summer of 2016, the Draft General Plan, Draft Climate Action Plan, and Draft EIR were released; in the summer through fall of 2016, workshops and comment periods were held; in January 2017, the Final EIR was released; and in the spring of 2017, adoption hearings were held; and

WHEREAS, the City of Woodland, as part of the process of updating the General Plan and preparing the Climate Action Plan Update, identified stakeholders for their input, appointed a citizen advisory committee, conducted a community-wide household survey, held six community workshops, 17 public meetings, nine City Council updates, two joint meetings of the City Council and Planning Commission, and four adoption hearings attended by members of the public, appointed and elected officials, and other affected agencies to assure public participation in the process; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Government Code Section 65302, a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan was prepared, which addresses the mandatory elements required by state law, and also includes optional elements for Administration, Community Design, Historic Preservation, Economic Development, Public Facilities and Services, and Sustainability; and

WHEREAS, the City's Housing Element, a mandatory general plan element, for the 2013-2021 planning period was updated, adopted, and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in 2013, and an amendment was subsequently prepared to ensure

consistency with the changes proposed for the other components of the Draft 2035 General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City submitted the amendment to HCD on July 29, 2016, and on September 22, 2016, the City received a letter from HCD stating that the amended Housing Element remains in compliance with State Housing Element law, and the updated Housing Element is included in the 2035 General Plan as Exhibit E; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Update was sent to affected public entities and agencies for their review and comment in accordance with Government Code sections 65302.5, 65302.7, 65302(g)(7), 65352, 65563, 65585, Public Resources Code section 2762(b) and (c), and Public Utilities Code section 21676; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Government Code section 65352.3, the City contacted California Native American tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission to invite these tribes to consult on the proposed General Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, since the release of the Public Review Draft of the Draft 2035 General Plan, and upon receipt of numerous comments from the public, the City prepared numerous amendments to the Draft 2035 General Plan, which are included as Attachment F to the March 2, 2017 staff report for the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the City also prepared the 2035 CAP, which is an expanded version of the City's Preliminary 2020 CAP, adopted by the City Council on July 15, 2014, and sets forth a strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions ("GHG") consistent with state law; and

WHEREAS, the Draft 2035 CAP seeks GHG emissions reductions of fifteen percent below 2005 levels by 2020, which is consistent with achieving a reduction in emissions of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050; and

WHEREAS, the Draft 2035 CAP includes six focus areas, which are Energy, Transportation and Land Use, Urban Forest and Open Space, Water and Solid Waste, Public Involvement, and Municipal Operations; and

WHEREAS, the City also received comments on the Draft 2035 Climate Action Plan from the public and presented proposed revisions to the Planning Commission, which were included as Attachment G to the March 2, 2017 Planning Commission staff report; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 *et seq.*) ("CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., §§ 15000 *et seq.*), the City prepared an environmental impact report analyzing and disclosing the potentially significant environmental impacts of the City's Draft 2035 General Plan as well as the Draft 2035 Climate Action Plan ("EIR"), and the EIR is adequate for decision-making purposes and reflects the independent judgment of the City of Woodland; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Government Code section 65353(a), the Planning Commission of the City of Woodland, California, did on the 2nd and 16th days of March 2017, hold duly noticed public hearings to consider the 2035 General Plan and the 2035 Climate Action Plan; and

WHEREAS, at said public hearings, all persons wishing to speak were given an opportunity to testify both for and against the 2035 General Plan Update, 2035 Climate Action Plan, and the accompanying Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2013032015); and

WHEREAS, at said public hearings, upon hearing and considering all testimony and arguments, if any, of all interested persons desiring to be heard, the Planning Commission makes the following findings in support of recommending approval of the 2035 General Plan and 2035 Climate Action Plan:

Findings for Approval:

1. The 2035 General Plan and all of the General Plan Elements comprise a logical, integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statement of City goals, policies and objectives.
2. The 2035 General Plan is reasonably related to the public health, safety, and welfare because it guides and accommodates land uses, housing, and circulation infrastructure in accordance with current law, community needs, and future demands.
3. The 2035 General Plan covers all territory within the boundaries of the City of Woodland and the area of likely expansion outside of the City as defined by the 2006 voter-initiated and approved Urban Limit Line.
4. Together with the City's adopted 2013-2021 Housing Element, as amended, the 2035 General Plan addresses all of the mandatory general plan elements.
5. The 2035 Climate Action Plan will provide the community with a well-defined planning framework related to energy efficiency and climate change effects and will streamline future projects' compliance with CEQA.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND, CALIFORNIA, AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the above recitations are true and correct and constitute the findings of the Planning Commission.
2. That the Planning Commission does hereby recommend to the City Council certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2035 General Plan and 2035 Climate Action Plan (SCH #2013032015), approval of the 2035 General Plan with all proposed revisions submitted to the Planning Commission during the March 2 and March 16, 2017 Planning Commission public hearings, and approval of the 2035 Climate Action Plan, including all proposed revisions submitted to the Planning Commission during the March 2 and March 16, 2017 Planning Commission public hearings.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Woodland, California, at its regular meeting held on the 16th day of March 2017, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

KIRBY WELLS, CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

CINDY NORRIS, SECRETARY
WOODLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Notes: Planning Commission Hearing #1

City Council Chambers
Thursday, March 2, 2017

Attendance

PLANNING COMMISSION

- Kirby Wells, Chairman
- Chris Holt, Vice Chairman
- Marco Lizarraga
- Elodia Ortega-Lampkin
- Steve Harris

STAFF/CONSULTANT TEAM

- Ken Hiatt, Assistant City Manager/
Community & Economic
Development Director
- Cindy Norris, Principal Planner
- Steve Coyle, Deputy Director of
Community Development
- Kara Ueda, City Attorney
- Heidi Tschudin, Tschudin
Consulting Group
- Sophie Martin, Dyett & Bhatia
- Matthew Gerken, AECOM
- Elizabeth Schmid, Dyett & Bhatia

PUBLIC

Approximately 30 members of the public
attended the meeting.

Meeting Notes

CAP/EIR COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

- *Marco Lizarraga*: How is service population defined?
 - *Matthew Gerken*: The sum of local residential population plus the sum of local jobs. If you live and work in Woodland, you would be counted twice.
- *Chris Holt*: Would we require soil testing ahead of any Specific Plan? I think the relative value of different types of farmland is distinctly different.
 - *Heidi Tschudin*: Yes. When a Specific Plan comes forward, that is one of the pieces of information that would be analyzed for the project level environmental review.
- *Chris Holt*: What are the benefits of meeting the emissions targets set by the State?
 - *Matthew Gerken*: You can choose what reduction strategies are your priorities. Being consistent with State emission targets at the community wide level through the CAP means projects don't have to prove that individually in their EIRs.
- *Kirby Wells*: We are using the FMMP, and it's not specific/accurate at the property level. We know that we have sprayed stuff on SP-2 land for years. Given that we know that there is a specific difference in this soil compared to other soil that has not been used as a sprayfield, why wouldn't we incorporate that information?
 - *Heidi Tschudin*: Peer reviewing individual properties is not required or appropriate for a General Plan level analysis. You would do this when an individual project comes forward. It's not usual for experts to disagree. In this case, we have two experts who are saying somewhat different things. We could look into this now, but it would be better to address the soils issue later when a project comes forward. What we have done here is consistent with the requirements under State law.
- *Kirby Wells*: What is the impact of a property being designated as farmland compared to "other."
 - *Heidi Tschudin*: There could be any number of factors. It would likely depend on what was being proposed with the project. It would also likely have mitigation impacts.

GENERAL PLAN COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

- *Chris Holt*: Are there implementation programs that address the new policies regarding housing for all?
 - *Elizabeth Schmid*: Yes. Most of the housing related policies and programs are contained within the Housing Element which is split between Chapter 9 and Appendix E.
- *Chris Holt*: How do we ensure that property owners *maintain* infrastructure?

- *Ken Hiatt:* It's not necessarily a developer obligation, unless the developer maintains ownership of the property. Maintenance becomes a burden of property owners.
- *Chris Holt:* Is the new growth strategy already decided? Or is that up to us? It seems like the growth strategy benefits whomever comes first now. Will future development be held to the numbers in Appendix B?
 - *Ken Hiatt:* Appendix B reflects what was analyzed in the environmental analysis. The General Plan has text that speaks to the General Plan horizon and the limits of what development can occur over that period. If a project comes forward and proposes development that is beyond what was analyzed in the EIR, they would have to complete a supplemental analysis.
- *Chris Holt:* What if we wanted to shift units from one part of the city to another?
 - *Ken Hiatt:* When a project comes in, we would compare the proposal with consistency with the EIR.
 - *Chris Holt:* So if the East comes in with a proposal that includes more than 1600 units, we wouldn't shift units from other parts of the city?
 - *Heidi Tschudin:* As long as the proposal is found to be consistent with what was analyzed and described in the EIR, it would be covered.
- *Chris Holt:* How does the growth strategy square with the Vision and Guiding Principles?
 - *Heidi Tschudin:* The obligation of the City Council and Planning Commission for any land use decision is to be able to demonstrate consistency with the General Plan.
- *Chris Holt:* Do you have to own the property out east ("900 acres") to do planning?
 - *Heidi Tschudin:* No, but you would need permission of the property owner to submit an application for the property.
- *Chris Holt:* What if we build out the entire ULL in the next 20 years?
 - *Heidi Tschudin:* Only the voters can modify the ULL. If the entire ULL is built out, and a decision was not made to increase density/intensity, then the voters would have to allow expansion beyond the current ULL.
- *Chris Holt:* What role does LAFCo play in the process?
 - *Heidi Tschudin:* The SOI is a legally identified area where growth is assumed to occur in the future. One of the first things the City will do after adoption of the General Plan, is approach LAFCo to make the ULL the same as the city's SOI. LAFCo is in charge of boundaries (city limits, special districts, etc.). They analyze whether amendments to boundaries (such as annexations) are appropriate.
- *Chris Holt:* If an entity controls land to the east, could they submit a Specific Plan as soon as this General Plan is adopted?

- o *Heidi Tschudin*: The land is owned by the City. If the City wanted to undergo a Specific Plan process, it could. People can plan properties as much as they want, but you need permission to go on someone's property and you need permission to file an application.
- *Chris Holt*: If we can't get a complete neighborhood in the East, how does that affect our EIR calculations?
 - o *Heidi Tschudin*: Upon submission of a Specific Plan application, an analysis will be conducted to ensure consistency with the General Plan and assumptions made in the EIR.
- *Chris Holt*: Did the flood group produce a document that spoke to what that the comprehensive flood solution is?
 - o *Ken Hiatt*: The flood group you're referring to is the Lower Cache Creek Flood Advisory Committee. They reviewed alternatives and took an action as a body to recommend a specific project as being the "locally preferred alternative" that is now being analyzed by the City and the Army Corps of Engineers.
 - o *Chris Holt*: Is there a publically available draft?
 - o *Ken Hiatt*: Yes, there's a draft report. We can provide that to you.
- *Kirby Wells*: On flood protection, the General Plan is looking at 200-year flood protection. What is Sacramento's level of flood protection?
 - o *Heidi Tschudin*: That number comes from a package of flood legislation from 2007 that changed the burden of liability from 100-year flood protection to 200-year flood protection for the Central Valley. This requirement comes out of that legislation.
 - o *Kirby Wells*: Is the city currently in the 200 year floodplain?
 - o *Ken Hiatt*: Yes, there are portions of the city that are within a 200 year floodplain.
- *Kirby Wells*: Why are we dropping the LOS standard to D?
 - o *Elizabeth Schmid*: This is a strategy that many communities are taking to shift the emphasis from vehicle flow to a more multimodal approach that also encourages walkability, etc. The State is shifting the way it looks at transportation impacts from LOS to VMT. Unlike LOS, VMT has a more direct correlation with greenhouse gas emissions and impacts on climate change. By maintaining an LOS standard as well as introducing a new VMT standard, the City is starting to shift the way it looks at transportation impacts as well.
 - o *Heidi Tschudin*: LOS measures traffic from the perspective of the car. If the car is experiencing congestion, a roadway segment or intersection is said to have a lower LOS. LOS doesn't take into account delay by other modes. VMT takes into account other modes. Using an LOS and VMT combined approach is one that many communities are taken. It really depends on your perspective and priorities.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- *Speaker 1 – Christine Shewmaker*
 - o CAP
 - For the General Plan Update and EIR, all public comments got a written response. CAP comments did not. Four of my suggestions for the CAP were not included in the revisions. I request written responses to all of my comments.
 - My unaddressed comments include:
 - 100% renewable energy in municipal realm by 2035
 - Implementation and monitoring – City Council agenda should be marked if an item is related to the CAP
 - Zero net energy, consistent with the changes that have been worked into the General Plan
 - Include a table that shows the percentages of the various different categories
 - o GPU
 - Happy to see that the City is striving for ZNE in more places.
 - I'm not a fan of undoing the phasing. This will negatively impact sustainability, sense of community (which is hard to create/maintain with leapfrog development), and our ability to "be in charge" (we won't have as much say as a community about the when and where new development occurs).
- *Speaker 2 – Terry Stark*
 - o Our Woodland farmland is an economic resource. Let's continue to protect it.
 - o Once our farmland has evaporated, we can't go back. So I say protect it.
- *Speaker 3 – Deborah Bautista Zavala*
 - o I advocate on behalf of my children for the preservation of prime farmland and flood protection.
- *Speaker 4 – David Moreno*
 - o Need to save prime ag land in an agricultural town.
 - o I've talked to many who share the same opinions.
 - o My grandfather and aunts and uncles were farmworkers, so this issue is personal to me.
 - o There is far more work to be done than just to grow and develop the city.
 - o 1:1 farmland mitigation isn't enough. We need to protect what we have inside the city.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS FOR STAFF

- *Marco Lizarraga:* On the economic side of things, it's important that we are maximizing profits and revenues.
 - o We can do all the planning we want regarding growth in the South and East, but the market will tell you where new development is going to go. Maintaining flexibility is key. Let the market determine where we will develop next.
 - o Prime ag land should be preserved where we grow real food.
 - o Like the inclusion of language about zero net energy development.
 - o Like the changes that you are recommending.
- *Steve Harris:* Transparency of process for this General Plan update was good. People really had an opportunity to have their voice heard.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

Brief responses to comments received on the Climate Action Plan (CAP) follow.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Comment 1 Presentation of Data - Reaching a broad audience. As a numbers type person, I find the presentation of the plan in the Executive Summary and Chapter 4 very hard to process. The leaves to me are not useful – but percentages are. I have no problem with the leaves remaining, I just think the document and particularly these two chapters should be useful to those that think in numbers as well as those that think in graphics. My example is the Yolo County elections website use of bars, percentages and actual numbers for election outcomes– so good for everyone. Before I could read and process this I needed to put it in a framework. That led me to make tables of the percentages. Examples are at attached. There are two versions – one for the overall goals and one that breaks it down into subsets. At a minimum I hope that the overall goals table could be an Appendix. In the GPU they had Appendix B that broke down the growth numbers – it was very useful.

Response: The staff is proposing to keep the information in the Executive Summary, Chapter 4, Appendix B, and Appendix D. The leaf symbol, developed to help the reader understand at a glance the relative contributions from each reduction strategy, was a part of the preliminary 2020 CAP. The staff is proposing to retain this tool as a part of the final CAP. Reductions, in both absolute and percentage terms, are presented for each sector in the Executive Summary. Regarding Appendix D, the purpose of Appendix D is to state the assumptions regarding the reduction estimates, not to replicate information already included in the CAP

Comment 2 Renewable energy – specifics relating to the change of percent, etc. In putting together the table of the percentages as described above, I noticed that for renewable energy the percent of the target for 2020 was now 16% for 2020 vs 35% in the preliminary 2020 CAP. The percent for 2035 is now 13%. Whoa! In reading I did note on page 2-3 in the draft CAP a very short statement that efficiencies/output of PVs had been revised. My first reaction to the substantial decrease in percent was why was Woodland aiming for less solar/ renewables? I did go then and look at the Preliminary 2020 CAP estimated installations and compared those to ones in the new Draft CAP. In looking at that, I can see for residential that we are actually increasing the MWs for renewables from ~ 13.5 to ~ 25MW for 2020– at least that is my impression. My recommendation is that you are more specific in the document about the changes in the estimates and highlight the fact (what I assume is the fact) –that we will actually aim for more renewables in terms of MW in homes. The same is true for businesses. Again if it is actually more MW for business sector, highlight the fact. The preliminary CAP was approved by the city council and is on line and the present MW goals are online on the Sustainability Dashboard. As the City of Woodland explores joining a CCE, the renewable energy goals in the CAP should be an integral part of the discussion. This is another reason to make sure to be specific that we are increasing the MW of our renewable energy goals.

Response: Clarifying language has been proposed by staff. The staff is proposing additional detail related to the calculation changes to 2020 estimates of the solar photovoltaic strategy. The language has been proposed:

AECOM calculated total solar electricity generation potential based on factors from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the RPS-compliant electricity emissions factor to avoid double counting reduction estimates from the statewide programs. To maintain a similar amount of GHG reductions in 2020, AECOM also increased the goal for total PV installations in 2020 as well.

Comment 3

The number you use for global warming potential (GWP) of methane varies between the CAP and the DEIR. In the CAP on page 3-1 you list it as 25, however on page 4.5-2 in the DEIR you say 28. In general it seems to me that researchers are moving towards the higher numbers. While in one spot the EPA says methane is more than 25 times greater than CO2 <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/overview-greenhouse-gases#methane> in another spot the EPA says 28 to 36 <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/understanding-global-warming-potentials> The IPCC now says 34 <https://cleantechnica.com/2013/10/04/ipcc-warns-methane-traps-much-heat-thought/> My feeling is the higher numbers are likely correct and I would like you to use 34 in your calculations, however, whichever you use, do be consistent between the DEIR and the CAP.

Response: The staff has proposed revisions to the CAP. The reference to methane GWP value was changed from 25 to 28 in the second paragraph under the heading, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventories.” At the time the draft CAP was prepared, 25 was correct. The revised value of 28 reflects current state of the science per Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fifth Assessment Report.

Comment 4

Comparing 2020 and 2035 goals. The 2020 total reduction goal is given in percent of 2005 emissions (15%), but the 2035 goal is given in MT CO2e/SP (2.25). The two are not directly comparable. So that the community can see the progress being proposed for 2020 to 2035 you need at some point to let folks know what the 2020 goal of 15% below 2005 would be in MT CO2e/SP. I would include it probably in Chapter 3 – where you talk about the targets – just let folks know the degree of difference that is needed between 2020 and 2035 by converting our 2020 goal of 15% below 2005 to an MT CO2e/sp. (And there is a table on page C-30 – but I think that 2020 number is a back calculation and does not equate to our 2020 goal of 15% below 2035). I would also include in Chapter 3 that our long term goal for 2050 is 0.83 MT CO2/sp (now in a table on C-30). (Although personally I think it should be zero). That way they can see that we will still need to tighten down further as we go towards 2050.

Response: The staff has proposed additional information that converts the 2035 efficiency target to a mass emissions target for easier comparison in the first paragraph under the heading, “2035 Emissions Target,” on page 3-7 of the CAP, as shown below.

The City’s longer-term 2035 target was developed to achieve an emissions efficiency level of 2.25 MT CO2e/service population. An efficiency threshold sets a target level of emissions per population or per service population. Service population [SP] = population + local jobs. Efficiency thresholds reflect a community’s ability to grow population and employment, while emissions shrink on a per

unit basis; in effect, a community could be growing more efficiently from an emissions standpoint. Thus, total emissions within a community may increase while still achieving an efficiency target, as long as the service population is growing faster than emissions. For comparison to the 2020 target, the 2035 efficiency target equates to emissions reductions of approximately 53% below 2005 levels.

Regarding a 2050 goal, this is described in Chapter 2, in the first paragraph of page 2-1. As noted, the GHG reduction targets described in the CAP were selected to help establish local emissions reductions on a long-term trajectory that is consistent with the State's own GHG emissions reduction goal for 2050 (i.e., 80% below 1990 levels).

Comment 5 Implementation and Monitoring. Identify council agenda items with CAP impact – large projects or individual actions. I like chapter 5 which covers this. It is new since the Preliminary CAP and a good addition. The CAP coordinator and individual responsible for each area are appropriate. My suggestion is that you add a requirement that someone identify for the council all agenda items with CAP impact. For some such as housing developments, it is obvious. For others, highlighting it would be good. My example is purchase of new fleet vehicles. These items routinely come before the council with no info on mpg, GHG emissions or how they fit into the policy to green the fleet. If the fleet item or any other relevant agenda item were flagged as CAP relevant, then there would need to be some discussion of what the CAP effect was and how it was being addressed.

Response: This recommendation was not included in the proposed revisions to the Draft CAP, but can be pursued separately by the City in the future, as appropriate.

Comment 6 100% Renewable from city by 2035 – be a role model. The city lists a goal of 80% reduction of emissions from electricity for both 2020 and 2035 (page 4F-3). The city should be a leader and a role model here, its goal for 2035 should be 100% renewable for electricity by 2035 – if not before.

Response: The staff is proposing to retain the goal, as written. The City would achieve a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions rate that is consistent with what the State of California would need to achieve goals for the State government under AB 32, Executive Order B-30-15, SB 32, and Executive Order S-3-05.

Comment 7 Included SB-32 more throughout the document. SB-32 (recently passed) should I think be mentioned more throughout the document, although the actual implementation is in some cases still to be decided. Places in should be included are Page 1-1 in purpose and need section and Page 2-2 under list of bills, etc. for policy.

Response: The staff has proposed revisions to the CAP to include references to the new legislation.

Comment 8 ZNE (Zero Net Energy) – just go for it. Some places say ZNE – other places list steps to it – just say ZNE is the goal for 2020 and work with that in mind. One example of this is on page 4G-2 – you say consider in 2025 if not meeting goals. Again on 4A-2, 4A-4 and 4A-6 it would seem easier to say going for ZNE on new residences than listing all options/actions. To me it

seems it would be less work if we say starting in 2017 we will strive for it (ZNE) with a goal to have it fully implemented by 2020.

Response: The staff has proposed to retain this language. As noted in Section 4G, the City will review the menu of potential actions to implement if there is insufficient progress on the GHG-reduction target. As proposed to be implemented, the City would achieve a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions rate under the CAP that is consistent with what the State of California would need to achieve goals for the State government under AB 32, Executive Order B-30-15, SB 32, and Executive Order S-3-05.

Comment 9

Tomato – Wastewater Reuse Sector. It is important to indicate that the wastewater reuse comes from tomato processing. This applies both to page 3-2 and C-7. You indicate the assumptions change with nitrogen use (C-7), and they most certainly would change I think if from a different crop. Best just to say tomato and from PCP. On page C-9 you explain that solid waste is now included in Woodland’s GHG inventory because it is now practice to include waste generated within the city (indirect?). As you have the GHG emissions the same for wastewater reuse for both East and South (page C-8), my take is that you are also assuming that irrespective of where the tomato waste is placed – the emissions will stay on the city of Woodland’s books. It is best if you state that assumption.

Response: The 2035 GHG analysis does not attempt to estimate the future location of wastewater reuse within the community. The 2035 GHG forecasts from this source are based on a scenario in which the rate of emissions generation per unit of activity (e.g., population, employment, service population) remains constant. In particular, the wastewater reuse emissions for 2035 were calculated based on the same equation used to estimate that sector’s emissions in 2020.

The staff has proposed adding a reference to tomato processing at Pacific Coast Producers as a source of wastewater reuse emissions in the first paragraph on page 3-2 of the CAP.

If in the future, there were no agricultural reuse of wastewater, the City may choose to update this portion of the GHG inventory. However, the City currently has no evidence that would suggest agricultural wastewater reuse would cease. Alternative assumptions regarding this issue would be speculative at this time. For the purposes of the analysis, the GHG emissions associated with the tomato cannery effluent are retained as part of the City’s emissions inventory. This would present a conservative analysis of GHG emissions if this practice were to cease in the future.

Even if this practice were to cease, this would have a minor effect on GHG emissions estimates. GHG emissions associated with wastewater reuse in the agricultural industry represent less than 1% of total community-wide emissions in the 2005 base year inventory and approximately 1% of the total community-wide emissions in the adjusted 2035 business as usual scenario. CAP reduction strategies were not developed specifically to address this sector because greater reduction opportunity is available in other sectors (e.g., energy, solid waste).

Regarding solid waste, additional clarifying information has been added to page C-9 in the

second paragraph under the heading “Solid Waste Emissions Estimates,” as shown below.

AECOM applied equations 8.1, 8.3, and 8.4 from the GPC for each of the land use alternatives considered (i.e., East and South Alternatives). The calculations assumed a baseline methane capture factor at the Yolo County Landfill of 75%, which corresponds to the free value in equation 8.3. The Yolo County CAP identified a 75% methane capture rate in the landfill as part of the inventory baseline conditions, as well as a goal of 90% capture for 2030. AECOM prepared the same analysis using the estimated waste disposals values for the 2020 target year to estimate strategy reductions in that target year, as well. The 2035 solid waste emissions estimates are based on the same per service population disposal rate for the South and East Alternatives, as described later in this section. Therefore, the estimates are not based on assumptions of different land uses that could occur under each alternative, which might result in a different solid waste disposal rate. Future GHG inventory updates are the best method for monitoring actual solid waste emissions in the community.

Comment 10

Small items – such as typos, etc. - but still important. On page 2-1 under climate science – for effects also include ocean warming and ocean acidification. One of the goals you list on page 4A-6 is to convert 100 electric heaters to gas? NO! We need to make electricity cleaner and electrify the whole system – transportation and buildings. Take that sentence out please. On 4B-6 place more emphasis on class I bikeways. On 4B-8 add goals for numbers of EV stations.

These last two below have previously been communicated to Roberta Childers but I include them here for completeness sake. On page 4A-8 - I assume the top goal on the left hand side applies to residential renewable energy - the word residential is just missing. In Appendix D - under E-6 - it lists 8.5 MW for both residential and non-residential PV installed since 2005. Are they really the same - they could be - on line at the dashboard in has 14.6 total with 8.5 for residential. I don't know the most recent numbers and the municipal install might not be in the 14.6 - so just checking if they are both the same at the moment. If they are - then going to 38+ by 2035 is tripling plus and going to 48.7 is more than tripling - more like quadrupling plus. So just checking on those numbers.

Response: Reference to ocean acidification has been proposed. The staff has proposed to delete reference to electric-to-gas heating unit conversion as a goal. Minor language changes and references to bicycle lanes and paths have been proposed under the seventh action as shown below.

Support and promote efforts to increase ~~bicycle use~~ bicycling through the provision of free or low-cost helmets and renovated bicycles to low-income residents, bicycle repair and safety clinics, bicycle lanes and paths, and information on safe bicycle routes.

Regarding a goal for EV charging stations, Strategy T/LU-7 encourages EV charging infrastructure in new residential developments. Opportunity for ease of at-home charging is a main factor in EV use and adoption, and the staff proposes that this goal be a focus for the 2035 CAP.

On page 4A-8, proposed edits to the goal include adding the word “residential” for clarity. The action is also proposed to be clarified to read “Encourage initial residential sizing of solar installations at 3kW or larger...”

Regarding estimates for PV installations, the values shown in Appendix D are million kWh generated from the PV systems, not total MW installed, so the references to tripling are correct as currently written.