

CHAPTER 4

Public Hearing Comments and Responses

Introduction

A summary of oral comments received at the various public hearings held for the Proposed Project is provided in this chapter. Responses to each of the oral comments are also provided.

Summary of Public Hearings

The City of Lincoln held a series of public hearings on the Draft 2050 General Plan. A list of the known attendees at each of the joint City Council/Planning Commission public hearings is provided in Table 4-1.

**TABLE 4-1
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDEES**

Public Hearing	Attendees
Public Hearing of November 21, 2006	Bill Plumb Barbara Webster, Lincoln Rifle Club Dennis Michael Chinnuck Terry Davis, Auburn Placer Group Sierra Club Roger Oldenkamp Dori Childress Warren Bostnick John Binkus Nancy Moore Norma Williams Frances Nevins Sue Hamman Janelle Grabelle David McCreary Sam Whittaker Karen Black Ed Bailey Amanda McCracken Jane Tahti Jerry Gamboa Paul Denzler James McLeod, Vice-President-WPUSD Board Vic Freeman Fran Nevins Lee Bastion, Sheridan Municipal Advisory Council Rich Frost Robert Kwan

**TABLE 4-1
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDEES**

Public Hearing	Attendees
Public Hearing of January 10, 2007	Marilyn Jasper, Placer Group Sierra Club John Binkus Steve Pounds Lenard Zick President, Lincoln Rifle Club David McCreary Jane Tahti Shirley Russell David McCreary
Public Hearing of January 30, 2007	Warren Bostick Jane Tahti Cheri Frost
Public Hearing of February 14, 2007	Dr. Alba Moore David McCreary Jane Tahti
Public Hearing of March 7, 2007	Don Chandler Warren Bostnick David McCreary Jane Tahti Ross Sneider Mark Chacon

Oral Comments and Responses

The verbal comments and the City’s response to the comment are summarized below according to commenter and public hearing date. In some cases, the commenter may be referred to previous responses to comments or Master Responses found in Chapter 3 “Response to Comments on the Draft EIR”. Comments that do not directly relate to the analysis in the Draft EIR (i.e., that are outside the scope of the Draft EIR) are not given specific responses.

Public Hearing of November 21, 2006

Bill Plumb

Comment: Indicated that he would like the 40% open space requirement to be retained in the General Plan and followed to retain a rural atmosphere.

Response: Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Barbara Webster, Lincoln Rifle Club

Comment: Indicated that she was requesting that the City maintain compatible land uses around the Lincoln Rifle range and that buffers be provided around the shooting range as noted in Policy OSC-1.3 and the description for V-2 page 4-27. She requested that Villages 2 and 3 be eliminated or relocated and the current Placer County zoning should remain to ensure adequate buffers around the Lincoln Rifle Range. Indicated that he would like the 40% open space requirement to be retained in the General Plan and followed to retain a rural atmosphere.

Response: As the commenter noted the Draft 2050 General Plan currently recognizes in its discussion of the Village 2 area that a buffer needs to be provided during the development of a Specific Plan that will maintain compatible lands uses. This same objective of providing adequate buffers in order to avoid incompatible land use issues is also noted in several policies including Policy LU-4.1 requiring buffers for industrial land uses. The existing Lincoln Rifle Range is currently located in Placer County and carries an Industrial land use and Zoning classification. The Draft 2050 General Plan retains the Lincoln Rifle Range in an Industrial land use which is located outside of either Village 2 or 3. This is designed to get the Lincoln Rifle Range as a conforming land use. In addition as noted above, Village 2 provides for the development of a buffer within the Village in order to maintain compatible land uses in this portion of the village. The determination of the details of the buffer will be established during the Specific Plan process for Village 2. Village 3 is nearly one mile north of the Lincoln Rifle Range and as a result is not seen as creating issues of land use compatibility similar to Village 2. The City believes that with the appropriate land use classification assigned to the Lincoln Rifle Range as Industrial and providing for the development of buffers in Village 2 that issues regarding compatibility are addressed by the Draft 2050 General Plan. Also refer to the responses prepared for comment letter “R” in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR.

Dennis Michael Chinnuck

Comment: Comments regarding the Lincoln Rifle Range were offered indicating that Mr. Chinnuck thought Village 2 and 3 will encroach on the Rifle Range. He requested that the Draft EIR show what the Draft 2050 General Plan update will do to the Rifle Range and how it is going to mitigate the use conflict.

Response: As noted above the Draft 2050 General Plan will retain an Industrial land use designation for the Lincoln Rifle Range, which is currently how it is classified under the Placer County General Plan. This land use designation is designed to retain the rifle range as a conforming land use. In terms of the adjoining villages, Village 2 and Village 3, Village 3 is located over a mile to the north of the rifle range and is not considered as creating compatibility issues with the rifle range operations. The Draft 2050 General Plan does contain policies requiring the provision of buffers to protect against land uses incompatibility (LU-4.1, and OSC-1.3) and in particular special note is made within the Village 2 description that during the development of the Specific Plan special attention to be made to design buffers for the outdoor shooting range (Draft 2050 General Plan, Page 4-27). Also, please refer to the response prepared for public commenter Barbara Webster.

Terry Davis, Auburn Placer Group Sierra Club

Comment: (a) Expressed a concern regarding the fiscalization of land use in California and wished the Draft 2050 General Plan was propelled by a different model.

(b) Expressed concern regarding the proposed expansion of the City sphere west of Dowd Road and the effect on the region and the PCCP.

Response: (a) While interest in the fiscal implications of land use decisions and the City's ability to sustain a desirable level of municipal services for the existing and future residents was one of the important considerations but was not the sole basis of the Draft 2050 General Plan. Other factors included an evaluation of the regional growth projects developed by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments for the next 50 years as part of the Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Study. That analysis indicated that by 2050 Placer County would develop some 269,000 new jobs and require an additional 158,000 new dwelling units. This growth was part of expected development to occur over the course of 50 years within the 6 country region of the Sacramento Metropolitan Area. The City as part of its planning efforts evaluated what level of the projected growth it could reasonably accommodate and accomplish the City's other stated objectives. The proposed boundaries were influenced by recognizing the various constraints to development, such as floodways, the airport over-flight zones, the location of the re-routing of State Highway 65 as well as the proposal to establish a Habitat Conservation Plan for Placer County known as the PCCP.

(b) The City has been a participant in the development of the PCCP from the beginning of the process and has worked closely with Placer County to coordinate its General Plan Update with the PCCP. The City's planning efforts regarding future urbanization are being evaluated as part of that process along with even larger proposals for urbanization in the unincorporated areas of the western Placer County. These proposals are all part of the discussions with the federal and state resources agencies in trying to develop an acceptable conservation plan.

As recently as January 23, 2007 the County Board of Supervisors determined to submit a proposed conservation map, which basically reflects the City's Draft 2050 General Plan, along with other development areas in the unincorporated portions of the County as a basis for further discussions with the resources agencies. The City's proposal is not viewed as having any more or less of an impact on the success of the PCCP than other projects currently under consideration. Please refer to Master Response #8 and to the various responses prepared for Comments V-2, V-4, V-5, and V-6 in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR.

Roger Oldenkamp

Comment: Requested that the recently adopted NEV Transportation Plan be included in the transportation element of the General Plan Update.

Response: Neighborhood Electric Vehicles are included in the Draft 2050 General Plan in the Transportation and Circulation Element, Policy T-4.8. Staff does propose to slightly change the draft policy in order to provide additional emphasis on the recently adopted NEV Transportation Plan. Please refer to Master Response # 5 in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR.

Dori Childress

Comment: (a) Indicated that she did not want the City to increase to 130,000, that it would destroy the rural environment, she asked that Villages 1 thru 4 not be developed and that development occur on home site of 5 to 10 acre parcels.

(b) Asked that a cap of 50 to 60,000 population be placed on development and no further commercial development along Highway 65 occur.

Response: Please refer to Master Response #8 and to the various responses prepared for Comments V-2, V-4, V-5, and V-6 in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR.

Warren Bostnick

Comment: Stated that the time and money spent on the General Plan study were wasted by using West Sacramento and Roseville. West Sacramento has a port, railroad terminal and major trucking businesses which Lincoln does not and Roseville has a railroad terminal and larger commercial base. He suggested other cities be used for comparison.

Response: While West Sacramento and Roseville were considered as a part of fiscal analysis (Draft EIR, Volume III, Appendix D) they were not the only cities evaluated. Among the other cities evaluated were Clovis, Petaluma, Fairfield, Vacaville, Visalia, Modesto, and Santa Rosa. The analysis did not look to precise matches in terms of each facility present in a community. The analysis considered the general economic characteristics that allowed each of these cities to achieve a particular service level and stream of revenues to sustain those services. This fiscal benchmarking allowed the City to consider various population levels and the economic opportunities that would likely result from them. The analysis indicates that each city may have unique aspects that allow it to gain economic success in various areas of commercial or industrial development. As part of the Draft 2050 General Plan updating process, City looks to take advantage of some of its economic opportunities such as the Lincoln Regional Airport and the Highway 65 Bypass corridor that will occur as a result of the rerouting of the State Highway.

John Binkus

Comment: Thought that preserving vernal pools was ridiculous and considered them a nuisance. He thought the City was wise to plan for the future and should consider extending further north to include Sheridan. He also thought that the airport should be moved 2 to 3 miles west so that it could be expanded and the vacant land used for development.

Response: Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Nancy Moore

Comment: Spoke on behalf of Dr. Darrin Moore asking that the office located at 271 Highway 65 be changed to a commercial land use from its current business and professional designation.

Response: Staff is proposing that the City consider designating this parcel as Commercial in light of the surrounding land uses and the potential for a site that can be developed.

Norma Williams

Comment: Indicated that she was concerned with the fast pace of growth and the school district being able to keep up. She suggested a joint effort between the City and School District.

Response: The jurisdiction for the planning and construction of new school facilities is under the direction of the Western Placer Unified School District Board and its employees. The Draft 2050 General Plan does provide for policies that call for the coordination of planning and siting of new schools during the review of new development projects. In addition the City policies call for a coordinate effort with the school district regarding the collection of development fees to pay for new schools in accordance with the provisions of state law. The City also works closely with the school district in the co-location of parks and schools to take advantage of joint use opportunities. Under the existing General Plan, the City has sited 4 new elementary school sites, 2 middle schools and 1 high school. These same policies are carried forth in the Draft 2050 General Plan. The City does work closely with the Western Placer Unified School District on a series of joint activities which include the locations for new school sites. Please see the response provided for Steve Pound's public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing for details.

Frances Nevins

Comment: Requested that a connecting road be added between Eastridge Drive and Whitney Oaks or Whitney Ranch Parkway within the City of Rocklin.

Response: This particular project area has previously been reviewed and approved by the City for development. Decisions regarding the roadway connections were determined based upon a traffic analysis and review by the various City Departments including police and fire. No safety concerns were noted in this area of the Twelve Bridges project due to a lack of connections into Rocklin. During the review of the project, the City of Rocklin expressed a preference to limit the number of connecting roadways between Lincoln and Rocklin due to concerns regarding traffic impacts.

Sue Hamman

Comment: (a) Expressed a concern regarding the WPUSD and its budget being able to keep pace with the City's growth.

(b) Concerned that the General Plan is taking growth to the extreme and asked the City to explain the financial need for additional growth.

Response: (a) As noted in the response provided for Steve Pound's public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing, the City works closely with the school district in terms of the location and number of schools required to serve new development.

The City also works cooperatively with the school district in terms of District's financing of new schools. The responsibility for the funding of new school construction is under the District's determination and is regulated by State law. The City cooperates with the District to ensure that new development projects are participating in the funding programs established by the school district.

(b) One of the City's goals with the Draft 2050 General Plan is to understand the fiscal implications of land use decisions and to establish a plan that would allow the City to be fiscally sustainable community in light of the regions growth projections and the potential establishment of a habitat conservation plan that could set the limits of urbanization in Placer County. To assist the City in the general plan update process, a firm specializing in municipal financing and economics prepared a fiscal benchmarking analysis (Draft EIR, Volume III, Appendix D) that was used to assist the City in determining future population.

Based on the analysis indicated that in order to sustain the desired level of services for residents, the General Plan Steering Committee recommended a future population of 120,000 persons given its location in the region and the economic opportunities.

City services such as police and fire are paid for through the city's general fund. Due to the limitations on property taxes it is important for a community to have a strong sales tax base in order to keep pace with the cost of general fund services. These factors indicated that for the City to maintain desired general fund service levels it would need to attract a significant level of retail activity. As part of creating the opportunities for such retail activity the area along the Highway 65 Bypass is an important factor in having an appropriate location for these land uses. In addition certain levels of population are needed into for such users to consider locating within a community. This was the basis for the General Plan Steering Committee's recommendations that a reasonable target population needed to achieve these objectives and economic sustainability would be in the 120,000 range.

Janelle Grabelle

Comment: Stated that the City should complete the Twelve Bridges trail system and the WPUSD should build the Twelve Bridges high school before starting new projects as mentioned in the Proposed General Plan.

Response: Please refer to the response provided for Steve Pound's public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing for details.

David McCreary

Comment: Expressed concern regarding the increase in population and having large retail centers. He did not want the school district to suffer because of growth caused by the Proposed General Plan.

Response: Please see the response provided for Steve Pound's public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing for details.

Sam Whittaker

Comment: Stated that the County maintains Nicolaus Road well, but that the City's portion between Airport Road and Lakeside Drive is full of potholes. He asked the Council/Commission to make smart decisions when considering growth under the Draft 2050 General Plan not only for City residents but for rural residents that might be impacted.

Response: Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Karen Black

Comment: Was concerned about the projected growth to 130,000 because the City and WPUSD cannot take care of the current population as seen with the potholes, schools and trails previously mentioned.

Response: Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Ed Bailey

Comment: Stated he was impressed with the planning involved in the Draft 2050 General Plan and was glad the City is planning on a strong tax base. He also was pleased that the transportation element is looking at the roadways outside the City and in the Placer region, so that we don't end up like the Bay Area.

Response: Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Amanda McCracken

Comment: Was concerned with the projected population growth to 130,000 and its impact on the school district and asked if the City and school district communicated.

Response: The City has worked closely with the school district in the planning of new schools needed to serve new development. The Draft 2050 General Plan does take into consideration the need for new school sites. The Draft 2050 General Plan provides for policies that call for the coordination of planning and siting of new schools during the review of new development projects. In addition the City policies call for a coordinated effort with the school district regarding the collection of development fees to pay for new schools in accordance with the provisions of state law. The City also works closely with the school district in the co-location of parks and schools to take advantage of joint use opportunities. Under the existing General Plan the City has sited 4 new elementary school sites, 2 middle schools and 1 high school. These same policies are carried forth in the Draft 2050 General Plan and will be used to identify the type, size and locations of new schools necessary to serve the increased population.

Jane Tahti

Comment: (a) Stated that in the transportation analysis of the EIR there were 25 out of 30 impacts listed as unavoidable after mitigation, why would citizens have to accept this.

(b) Indicated that she was concerned with the General Plan's effect on animal life and air quality and asked for a study that will cite the health impacts between a City of 66,000 versus one of 130,000.

Response: The traffic analysis does list 25 significant unavoidable impacts resulting from traffic increases from the Draft 2050 General Plan; however these are not 25 cumulative impacts. The traffic modeling represents an analysis of four different scenarios, "Existing plus Project", "Cumulative Conditions 2050", "Cumulative Conditions without Placer Parkway" and "2025 Plus Project Conditions". In each of these traffic model runs the same basic 6 impacts are noted as significant and unavoidable. The majority of these impacts are listed as significant and unavoidable not because there aren't any mitigation measures that could reduce them to a less than significant level, but due to the impacts being outside the jurisdiction of the City. For example the analysis indicated there would be an increase in vehicular traffic on roadways in unincorporated Placer County. Since the City can not ensure that the mitigation measures would be implemented they need to be listed as significant and unavoidable. The City is working with the surrounding jurisdictions to coordinate a method of addressing such impacts and those that other jurisdictions will have upon Lincoln. This policy is set forth in Policy T-2.20 of the Transportation and Circulation Element to coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions. Impacts within the City's planning boundaries are reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

(b) The Draft EIR in Chapter 10 “Alternatives”, beginning at page 10-1 does evaluate 6 project alternatives that range in population size from 65,300 up to 130,000. Each alternative is evaluated in terms of its various impacts including air quality, biological resources, traffic, noise, and agricultural resources as well as other topics.

Jerry Gamboa

Comment: Supported having more retail in the city, but was concerned with impacts on education and open spaces. He stated that infrastructure should be in place prior to growth that accompanies the Draft 2050 General Plan.

Response: The City works closely with the school district to address the need for new facilities. Please refer to the above response provided for Steve Pound’s public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing for details regarding schools.

The Draft 2050 General Plan also call for the provision of a significant amount of open space in newly developing areas by requiring 40% open space within each of the Specific Plan areas for the Villages.

In terms of infrastructure needed to serve new development, the Draft 2050 General Plan in Chapter 6, Public Facilities and Services Element the sets forth a series of policies designed to provide needed infrastructure in a timely manner to serve new residents. The Draft EIR in n Volume III includes a series of technical studies that analyzes the basic infrastructure regarding water, drainage, wastewater and roadways to serve new projected growth. Once the General Plan is adopted such improvements will become part of the City’s Public Facilities Element Fee Program designed to fund needed infrastructure.

Paul Denzler

Comment: Indicated he was concerned about the City being trapped by urban sprawl and felt transportation and its impacts on current residents should be considered when planning growth.

Response: The Draft EIR in Chapter 5 “Transportation and Circulation” provides a complete analysis of the impacts associated with the Draft 2050 General Plan both on existing and future roadway systems. This analysis will be part of the information considered by the City in making a determination regarding the approval of the Draft 2050 General Plan.

James McLeod, Vice-President-WPUSD Board

Comment: Indicated that the school district is working with the City and had a Board member serve on the General Plan Steering Committee. He encouraged the public to bring their concerns regarding the schools to the WPUSD Board.

Response: Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Vic Freeman

Comment: Noted that the Draft 2050 General Plan is a 40 – 50 year plan and that issues raised during the hearing would be addressed in time. He felt that a City of 130,000 with a 40% open space requirement would have a better feel than a City of 50,000 with no open space. He also noted that the many services residents had concerns about such as infrastructure and education require an increase in revenues that the increased population would provide.

Response: Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Fran Nevins

Comment: Stated that during her 2 years here she had seen the City double in size and seen services suffer such as the Twelve Bridges schools and trails.

Response: Please see the response provided for Steve Pound's public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing for details regarding schools.

Lee Bastion, Sheridan Municipal Advisory Council

Comment: (a) Indicated that he was concerned the Draft 2050 General Plan would increase traffic and congestion.

(b) Also felt that the City's westward expansion was too close to Sheridan and that it may impact groundwater.

Response: (a) The Draft 2050 General Plan's impact on traffic and congestion are analyzed in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project will add to existing and future roadway networks. Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and in some instances impacts are determined to be significant and unavoidable.

(b) The City's proposed boundaries are approximately 3 miles south of Sheridan, which is an estimated one-half mile closer than the City's current sphere of influence. In terms of groundwater impacts, the City does not rely upon groundwater as a primary source of water for new development. Water to service the Draft 2050 General Plan area would be derived from surface water purchased from Placer County Water Agency and/or the Nevada Irrigation District. The City utilizes groundwater only as a backup for emergency use or to reduce peak demands. In earlier studies the City has determined that groundwater is flowing in a northeast to southwest direction which is below and away from the Sheridan area. The City's analysis of its groundwater usage under the Draft 2050 General Plan has determined that the City's use of groundwater would have a less than significant impact, see Page 6-9 of the Draft EIR.

Rich Frost

Comment: Stated he was concerned with increases in traffic congestion and the Twelve Bridges high school not being built.

Response: Please see the response provided for Steve Pound's public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing for details regarding schools. Please refer to the response provided for Jane Tahti's public comment submitted at the November 21, 2006 public hearing for details regarding traffic.

Robert Kwan

Comment: Was concerned with the delay of the Twelve Bridges high school construction and felt that great communities have great school districts. Stated he was concerned with increases in traffic congestion and the Twelve Bridges high school not being built.

Response: Please see the response provided for Steve Pound's public comment submitted at the January 10, 2007 hearing for details regarding schools. Please refer to the response provided for Jane Tahti's public comment submitted at the November 21, 2006 public hearing for details regarding traffic.

Public Hearing of January 10, 2007

Marilyn Jasper, Placer Group Sierra Club

Comment: (a) Noted that their issues on the Draft EIR were covered in the November 4, 2006 joint comment letter from U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish & Game.

(b) Stated that there is an unhealthy reliance on development as presented in policy PFS-2.7.

(c) Stated that the economic development report contains meaningless words and phrases as, could, potentially, is likely, etc.

(d) Stated that City should impartially inform city residents of the potential impacts of the Draft 2050 General Plan update and should allow residents to vote on this issue.

Response: (a) Please refer to the Final EIR in Chapter 3, "Response to Comment" for Responses A-1 thru A-33.

(b) Policy PFS-2.7 refers to the use of groundwater as an emergency backup supply and to supplement the domestic supply provided by PCWA and NID. The policy does not relate to reliance upon development.

(c) The comment does not relate specific examples from the fiscal analysis relative to the phrases mentioned. The fiscal analysis prepared by Economic & Planning Systems (Draft EIR, Volume III, Appendix D) used in part a benchmarking survey of other communities focused primarily on retail land uses and fiscal revenues and expenditures. This analysis served as a basis to assist the General Plan Steering Committee in determining the size and characteristics of growth that would help the City in achieving its economic and fiscal objectives. While such data is relevant and useful in making decisions it can not be viewed as assuring specific results. Language in the report would tend to reflect this with the use of similar phrases.

(d) The Draft EIR for the Draft 2050 General Plan does present an impartial review of the potential impacts associated with the proposed General Plan. The Draft EIR has been made available to the general public as a basis for providing information on Proposed Project's potential impacts. The request for a citizen's vote on the project will be determined by the City Council.

John Binkus

Comment: He indicated that he resides 5 miles north of Lincoln on Highway 65 and is in favor of the Draft 2050 General Plan. He would like the planning boundaries extended to Sheridan to provide potential infrastructure and an improved tax base.

Response: The General Plan Steering Committee had evaluated extending the planning boundaries for the General Plan north of Coon Creek but determined that due to a variety of land use constraints and infrastructure cost it was not a feasible undertaking. Given these constraints staff would not recommend altering the planning boundaries to extent north of Coon Creek. Please refer to the response prepared for Comment A-1 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR.

Steve Pounds

Comment: Commented that the school had not been given the same attention as the City infrastructure. He indicated that the schools should receive as much attention as the sewer system.

Response: The jurisdiction for the planning and construction of new school facilities is under the direction of the Western Placer Unified School District Board and its employees. The Draft 2050 General Plan does provide for policies that call for the coordination of planning and siting of new schools during the review of new development projects. In addition the City policies call for a coordinate effort with the school district regarding the collection of development fees to pay for new schools in accordance with the provisions of state law. The City also works closely with the school district in the co-location of parks and schools to take advantage of joint use opportunities. Under the current General Plan the City has sited 4 new elementary school sites, 2 middle schools and 1 high school. These same policies are carried forth in the Draft 2050 General Plan.

Lenard Zick, President-Lincoln Rifle Club

Comment: Would like the City's existing goals to provide recreational opportunities to continue by allowing the Rifle Club to continue in Lincoln.

Response: The Draft 2050 General Plan has placed the existing rifle range within an industrial land use which would be considered a compatible designation for this use. In addition specific attention is given within the discussion of the Village 2 area, (Draft 2050 General Plan, page 4-27) which is east of the rifle range, that during the preparation of the Village 2's specific plan, that a detailed evaluation be undertaken to provide for adequate buffers for the rifle range. Please refer to the responses prepared for Letter R in Chapter 2 and the response to the public hearing comment from Barbara Webster.

David McCreary

Comment: Indicated that he was concerned about policy PFS-9.2 regarding development of new schools, because the planned high school within the existing plan has been delayed. [Note: Mr. McCreary's other questions were addressed during the meeting.]

Response: As noted in response to Steve Pound's comment above, while the City works closely with the Western Placer Unified School District regarding the setting aside of new school sites and their design during the review of development plans, the responsibility for the timing of construction and funding of such projects resides with the District.

Jane Tahti

Comment: (a) Asked when the City of Lincoln expands into a conservation easement, as it did with the Hoffman easement, does it count towards the 40% open space required in this plan.

(b) Asked that the Draft 2050 General Plan update and expansion of population to 130,000 be presented to all citizens through a vote.

Response: The Draft 2050 General Plan policy LU-15.13 which calls for 40% open space within each village or specific plan area does allow for natural areas which are permanently retained as open space, such as streams, floodways or wetlands to be counted towards the 40% requirement. Regarding the Hoffman easement, a determination will occur when the City is considering the specific plan for Village-3. Please refer to the responses prepared for Comments HHHH-1, HHHH-3, and HHHH-5 in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.

(b) The request for a citizen's vote on the project will be determined by the City Council.

Shirley Russell

Comment: Expressed concern regarding school facilities and how to ensure the needed high school is built.

Response: Please refer to above response to Steve Pound and above response to Dave McCreary.

David McCreary

Comment: (a) Asked if the City of Lincoln will be able to meet infrastructure needs if the Draft 2050 General Plan update is approved.

(b) Inquired if the City is committed to a community pool that was tied into the Twelve Bridges high school project?

(c) Won't the village planning used in the Draft 2050 General Plan update segregate citizens and result in a loss of lifestyle, charm and open spaces?

Response: (a) The Draft EIR (Volume III, Appendixes E, F, G and H) included an analysis of the infrastructure (streets, water supply, sewer and drainage) required to service the Plan's projected population. As with the existing General Plan, once the City approves an update to the General Plan the infrastructure required to service the plan will be placed into the City's Public Facilities Element Fee Program. This program is used to provide the necessary funding from new development to pay for the identified infrastructure and to bring these improvements on line in a timely manner to serve new residents and businesses.

(b) The City has not formally committed to the placement of a community pool at the proposed Twelve Bridges high school. Some discussions regarding the possibility of a joint use project of this nature have been held but no formal action has been taken to date.

(c) The design concepts involved with the villages is not to make them isolated areas, but to tie them back into the existing portion of the city utilizing a variety of means. This would include connections utilizing roadways, bikeways and pedestrian trails where possible. The intent of the Villages is to enhance lifestyles by moving away from the more suburban forms of land use design to more of an integrated form that allows for mixed uses and a variety of housing choices, transportation choices and open space. These goals are set forth in the Land Use Element of the Draft 2050 General Plan and in particular Section 4.4 of the element sets forth the goals and criteria that will be used to design villages to meet these objectives.

Public Hearing of January 30, 2007

Warren Bostick

Comment: (a) Indicated that he was concerned that the buffers won't allow agricultural residents to continue in their endeavors and asked if the issue had been addressed.

(b) Indicated that Policy LU-5.4 regarding buffers only applied to land under the Williamson Act or a conservation easement.

Response: (a) The Draft 2050 General Plan provides for policies that are designed to protect agricultural land uses outside the City's planning boundaries. Such policies are set forth in LU-5.4, LU-5.5 and OSC-2.1 and OSC-2.2.

(b) Policy LU-5.4 is not limited in its application to agricultural land that is under the Williamson Act or a conservation easement those were only used by way of example. Any parcel of land that is outside the City's planning boundaries for urbanization would be considered as an area to be buffered. This review and design of buffers would occur during the development of the Specific Plan for that village or special use district.

Jane Tahti

Comment: Asked why Village 7 is referred to as 7 when it seems like it will developed first and indicates a preference that a village be completely developed before moving on to the next village.

Response: The numbering of villages is for purposes of identification only and is not meant to establish a particular order or sequence in their development. The Draft 2050 General Plan would not require the complete development of any one particular village or special use district before a separate area could move forward with development. The sequence and rate of the villages or special use districts development will be influenced by market conditions and the cost and timing of infrastructure.

Cheri Frost

Comment: (a) Wanted the Draft 2050 General Plan scaled back to 60 – 80,000 at build out and wanted it voted upon by citizens.

(b) Asked can Villages 1 & 2 be design before the Draft 2050 General Plan update has been approved.

(c) Why is there no mention of NEV's.

(d) Why is there so much density in Villages 5, 6 and 7, when that part of Lincoln already has the most high density, why isn't it balanced.

(e) Why isn't the use of the airport expanded using the foreign trade zone?

Response: (a) The future City's population will be determined by the City Council with a recommendation from the Planning Commission who will consider the General Plan Steering Committee's recommendation. The request for a citizen's vote on the project will be determined by the City Council.

(b) The City would allow the design of a village to be undertaken before the Draft 3050 General Plan update is adopted. At the beginning of the General Plan update process, the City adopted a set of interim procedures allowed development applications to be submitted and begin the review process. However if this is done then the applicant(s) are at risk that the adopted General Plan may not allow for the particular uses or design that had been submitted and in such a case would be required to redesign. In addition while an application could be submitted to begin the process, the projects would have to await the adoption of the General Plan update before their application could be considered for approval.

(c) Neighborhood Electric Vehicles or (NEV's) are included in the Draft 2050 General Plan within the Transportation and Circulation Element, under Policy T-4.8. Please refer to Master Response #5 in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR.

(d) The initial land use formulas for each of the villages was based upon an evaluation of the land and physical constraints presented in each village and a review of the land use mix developed by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments as part of the "Blueprint" project. Based upon a review of the land and physical constraints presented in each village, there was greater opportunities presented in Villages 5, 6, and 7 to achieve the land use mix suggested by the Blueprint project. The villages to the east tended to have greater constraints in the way of oak woodlands and topography that made it more difficult to achieve a similar mix of residential densities. Villages 5, 6 and 7 are in excess of three miles from areas in the existing City that carry a significant amount of high density residential. Villages 5, 6 and 7 will have direct access the Highway 65 Bypass which will be a major regional roadway. Both the current and Draft 2050 General Plan have assigned high density residential land use throughout the city as a method of providing a mixture of housing types and a balance housing stock as well as to meet the Housing Element goals. Please refer to the response prepared for Comment YY-6 in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR.

(e) The City current has a large area of land around the Lincoln Regional Airport that is authorized as a foreign trade zone, which provides certain benefits related to avoiding tariffs on products moved into the United States. On occasion a small amount of the area has been used to take advantage of these benefits, but currently there are no users in the foreign trade zone. This could be for a variety of reasons having to do with access to the industrial park and market

conditions. Any changes in the foreign trade zone would not be regulated by the City but would have to occur with the approval of the Sacramento Port Authority, currently there seems to be no need to consider an expansion.

Public Hearing of February 14, 2007

Dr. Alba Moore

Comment: Requested that the property located at 271 Highway 65 be changed from Business and Professional to a Commercial land use.

Response: The City has previously received this request in written. This request along with similar requests will be considered by the City at an upcoming hearing

David McCreary

Comment: (a) Indicated that he didn't think safety issues such as crime rates were addressed.

(b) Asked to have "pocket park" defined.

(c) Asked how noise can be mitigated.

(d) What percentage of parks will be lighted.

Response: (a) The expansion of police services is address as part of the Draft 2050 General Plan (Public Facilities Element, Chapter 6) and Draft EIR (Chapter 6, Public Facilities and Services, page 6-36 to 6-43). The expansion of needed police facilities to serve the proposed population levels are discussed in Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR.

(b) Pocket parks are defined in the Draft 2050 General Plan through Policy OSC-7.19. These are passive recreational areas between 0.25 to 0.50 acres in size. These are viewed as social gathering areas within neighborhoods.

(c) Standard measures to mitigate noise typically involve the use of barriers in the form of solid walls, earthen berms or combinations of both. In addition noise may be mitigated through the use of setbacks to create sufficient distance between the source of noise and the receptor.

(d) At this time no determination has been made regarding the number of parks with lighting. These determinations would be made during the review process of Specific Plans and based upon an analysis of the recreational needs of the City at that time for additional facilities with lights. Such facilities would typically be placed within Community or City-wide parks as opposed to neighborhood park facilities.

Jane Tahti

Comment: Questioned the use of off-site mitigation in Policy OSC-5.6, No Net Loss of Wetlands and is concerned that wetlands will not be protected.

Response: Policy OSC-5.6 provides for a no net loss of wetlands. The policy in accordance with federal regulations regarding wetlands recognizes that some component of a mitigation plan to achieve no net loss of wetlands may involve off-site mitigation in the form of off-site mitigation banks or similar mitigation measures recognized by the federal permitting agencies.

Public Hearing of March 7, 2007

Don Chandler

Comment: Expressed a concern regarding the traffic impacts of diesel trucks on residential streets such as East Avenue and requested Policy T-2.6 clearly designate routes.

Response: Draft 2050 General Plan Policy T-2.6 states that the City will designate truck routes and restrict truck traffic on residential. Currently the City has designated truck routes to include SR 65 and SR 193 with City street segments that include Seventh Street from SR 65 to East Avenue and East Avenue from Seventh Street to SR 193, Nicolaus Road and H Street to SR 65. No other determinations regarding truck routes have been made by the City Council at this time.

Warren Bostnick

Comment: Requested that Airport Road be extended to Wise Road as the City has received the right of way at no cost and this should have been done a long time ago.

Response: Airport Road is an existing two lane roadway that extends north from Nicolaus Road but does not currently intersect with Wise Road as an improved road. There currently exists right of way for Airport Road through to Wise Road but it has not been developed. The entire length of Airport Road is approximately 2 miles with only one mile having limited roadway improvements. Typically the construction of such an improvement would occur with requests for new development. That portion of the City has not at this point received requests for development. The western side of the alignment is currently in the unincorporated portion of Placer County.

David McCreary

Comment: Expressed concern that the signage for NEV's on Joiner Parkway is confusing. He noted that the City should look at traffic restrictions prior to the Lincoln Bypass at SR 65 and I 80. He was also concerned regarding aircraft that were flying too low near the airport.

Response: The comment regarding signage is noted. The City as part of the traffic analysis does include an analysis of SR 65 back to Interstate 80. This evaluation indicated that additional improvements to SR 65 will be required as a result of additional growth in the region traffic including additional traffic resulting from the Draft 2050 General Plan. Concerns regarding low flying aircraft can be reported to the Lincoln Airport Manager. Concerned residents should include the identification numbers from the aircraft when reporting such incidents.

Jane Tahti

Comment: Expressed concern regarding the impact of big rig truck, especially Teichert vehicles and their effect while idling in increased traffic resulting from the General Plan. She hopes that the transportation element will cover this concern.

Response: The Draft EIR in Chapter 5 provides an analysis for the traffic impacts that evaluate the traffic impacts for the roadway system and along State Route 65. Trucks as a component of the traffic mix are included in the analysis. The Draft EIR in Chapter 8 provides an air quality analysis that includes data from the transportation modeling and the mix of trucks used in the traffic model runs.

Ross Sneider

Comment: Expressed concern with an SR 193 realignment and how it will affect the Village 1 area. He was concerned truck traffic will be re-routed to the area he lives on Virginia-town Road.

Response: The Draft 2050 General Plan does not propose to realign State Highway 193. The Draft 2050 General Plan does propose the addition of a new roadway that will intersect with SR 193 and run north crossing Auburn Ravine and Virginia-town Road and connecting to SR 65. This same alignment would also run south and connect to Sierra College Blvd. to the east. It is anticipated that SR 193 will remain in its present alignment. This new roadway would bring additional traffic through a portion of the Virginatown Road area.

Mark Chacon

Comment: Indicated that he is in favor of the Draft 2050 General Plan and hopes all new villages will extend the bike trails and that recreational activities will continue to be encouraged.

Response: The Draft 2050 General Plan does include provisions for the development of bikeways and pedestrian trails in the newly developed village areas. The Plan also calls for the continued development of new recreational facilities in the form of new parks, multi-purpose facilities, and swimming pools.