

## NOTICE OF A REGULAR MEETING

Pursuant to Section 54954.2 of the Government Code of the State of California, a Regular meeting of the City of Tracy **Planning Commission** is hereby called for:

**Date/Time:** Wednesday, September 11, 2013  
7:00 P.M. (or as soon thereafter as possible)

**Location:** City of Tracy Council Chambers  
333 Civic Center Plaza

Government Code Section 54954.3 states that every public meeting shall provide an opportunity for the public to address the Planning Commission on any item, before or during consideration of the item, however no action shall be taken on any item not on the agenda.

### REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

MINUTES APPROVAL

DIRECTOR'S REPORT REGARDING THIS AGENDA

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE - *In accordance with Procedures for Preparation, Posting and Distribution of Agendas and the Conduct of Public Meetings, adopted by Resolution 2008-140, any item not on the agenda brought up by the public at a meeting, shall be automatically referred to staff. If staff is not able to resolve the matter satisfactorily, the item shall be placed on an agenda within 30 days*

1. OLD BUSINESS
2. NEW BUSINESS

#### **A. APPOINT A PLANNING COMMISSIONER TO THE SENIOR STEERING COMMITTEE**

3. ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE
4. DIRECTOR'S REPORT
5. ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION

#### **A. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

6. ADJOURNMENT

Posted: **September 5, 2013**

The City of Tracy complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act and makes all reasonable accommodations for the disabled to participate in public meetings. Persons requiring assistance or auxiliary aids in order to participate should call City Hall (209-831-6000), at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Any materials distributed to the majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Development and Engineering Services department located at 333 Civic Center Plaza during normal business hours.

**MINUTES**  
**TRACY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**WEDNESDAY, July 24, 2013**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**CITY OF TRACY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**333 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA**

**CALL TO ORDER** Chair Ransom called the meeting to order at 7:01p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Chair Ransom led the pledge of allegiance

**ROLL CALL** Roll Call found Chair Ransom, Vice Chair Sangha, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Mitracos, and Commissioner Orcutt. Also present were staff members Bill Dean, Assistant Development Services Director, Cris Mina, Senior Civil Engineer, Scott Claar, Associate Planner, Victoria Lombardo, Senior Planner Bill Sartor, Assistant City Attorney and Jan Couturier, Recording Secretary.

**MINUTES APPROVAL**

Chair Ransom requested a review of the June 26, 2013 minutes and asked for comments. Commissioner Orcutt made a motion to approve the minutes from June 26, 2013, Vice Chair Sangha seconded; all in favor, none opposed.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT REGARDING THIS AGENDA** – None

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE** – None

1. **OLD BUSINESS** – None

2. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A REZONE OF A 47.1-ACRE PARCEL FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL OF A CONCEPT, PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF A VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FOR A 252-LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION, KNOWN AS KAGEHIRO PHASE 3, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF CORRAL HOLLOW ROAD AND KAGEHIRO DRIVE, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 242-040-36. THE APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER IS CORRAL HOLLOW DEVELOPMENT, LLC. APPLICATION NUMBERS PUD13-0001 AND TSM12-0001**

Chair Ransom reviewed item 2A and called for a staff report.

Scott Claar, Associate Planner, presented the staff report stating that the project consisted of a rezone from Low Density Residential to Planned Unit Development, approval of a Concept, Preliminary and Final Development Plan, and approval of a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to create 252 residential lots for single-family homes.

Mr. Claar reviewed the location of the project and advised that the applicant's proposal to rezone the property from Low Density Residential to Planned Unit Development has been

used throughout many areas of the City to achieve creative site plans that do not fit within the constraints of a particular zone, such as Low Density Residential.

The proposed Planned Unit Development zoning regulations would allow lot sizes that are slightly smaller and narrower than allowed in the Low Density Residential zone, houses that are slightly closer together, and houses that cover slightly more of the lot. The proposed setbacks and lot sizes are similar to many other Planned Unit Developments that have been approved throughout the City.

He further stated that the proposed architecture consisted of six plan types; all single-family detached homes with four to five different elevations per plan for a total of 28 different house designs. He added that these plans were in keeping with the City of Tracy's Design Goals and Standards. He then reviewed the fact that the proposed Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map would subdivide the 47.1 acre parcel into 252 residential lots and public streets with sidewalks and landscaping.

Mr. Claar indicated that the developer had conducted a neighborhood meeting with approximately 30 residents in attendance. He added there were some concerns relative to additional traffic caused by the development, but that projects to address these issues were in the design phase. Mr. Claar added that the California Environmental Quality Act Analysis indicated no significant impacts.

Mr. Claar reviewed the amended conditions of approval which were handed out to the commissioners prior to the meeting relating to certain of the streets in the proposal. He also advised that although the Development Fee impacts have not yet been approved by City Council, but that this project will be subject to the new fee structure.

Commissioner Mitracos, requested clarification about the Commission's ability to approve the project without an accurate vesting tentative map. Mr. Claar advised the Commission would approve the project as it is and any modifications would be brought back to the Commission.

Mr. Dean added clarification about the letter which had been sent to him from the developer waiving their rights relative to their vesting status of the Development Impact Fees.

Mr. Claar concluded that staff was recommending approval of rezoning of the project from Low Density Residential to Planned Unit Development and a concept, preliminary and final development plan, and approval of a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map.

Chair Ransom commented about the need to have a break in the meeting to allow the Commissioners time to review the recent revisions prior to voting on the project and then brought the meeting to the commission.

Commissioner Orcutt asked about the use of the use of "expand" relative to the existing park. Mr. Claar provided clarification indicating that there is extra land into which the park can be expanded.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the in lieu fees could be used in that immediate area or for that specific area. Mr. Claar indicated that the intent is to use within that project.

Chair Ransom asked about the changes to the zoning from Low Density Residential to Planned Unit Development which Mr. Claar explained and provided a review of the Design Goals and Standards.

Chair Ransom asked about the waste water treatment standards and then asked what options developers have. Mr. Claar commented that the storm water requirements are in accordance with state law and added this was the first development to go through this process. Mr. Dean clarified that because these requirements were new, the city is learning how to work within these guidelines.

Commissioner Mitracos asked about the stop sign analysis. Criseldo Mina reviewed the warrant analysis indicating it is a study conducted which counts the number of cars that pass through an intersection and provided the requirements for adding a stop sign. Commissioner Mitracos then asked if speed of traffic was taken into consideration. Mr. Mina advised the warrant analysis is based on volume, not speed.

Commissioner Mitracos asked about the landscape strip between the street and sidewalk and asked about the types of trees and who makes the decision about the list of approved trees. He felt the specific tree should be included in the project specification. Mr. Dean advised that a review of the list of approved trees would be used. Commissioner Mitracos stated that he felt the specific tree was important enough to be included in the project packet.

Chair Ransom opened the public hearing at 7:35

The applicant, Jerry Finch, provided some background to the project. He then provided a review of the project and the design guidelines process and advised the project was intended to meet existing standards. He reviewed the market conditions, spoke to traffic design and then spoke of upgraded amenities for the homes in the project. He reviewed the placement of parks and how they fit into the development.

Mr. Finch indicated that the developers plan to pay their sewer fees in advance which will provide 1650 additional hook ups for the area. He also discussed Residential Growth Allotments and that this development would likely build out completely in 6 to 7 years and that building would begin some time in 2014.

Dan Hale from Hunt, Hale, Jones and Associates provided a PowerPoint presentation covering the design elements of the project. He spoke to the process of design, the number of elevations and styles and other architectural and landscape details. He then summarized the attention to the site plan as well as the design elements to make the neighborhood inviting.

Chair Ransom continued the public hearing at 8:00 p.m. and asked if there were additional public comments; there were none.

Chair Ransom asked if there were any questions from the Commission. Commissioner Orcutt asked about the side entrance design. Mr. Hale responded that the non-traditional approach to the residence would be guided by a short wall and arbor. It makes it more interesting. The floor plan makes more sense once you enter the home.

Commissioner Orcutt asked how non-traditional the side entrance design would be laid out in the development relative to the residences next to it. Mr. Finch provided scenarios that would work.

Commissioner Mitracos expressed surprise at the size of the homes adding that he felt the market would demand smaller homes. Mr. Finch advised that the market place would prefer a larger home.

Chair Ransom called for a break to provide the commissioners with an opportunity to review the new revisions to the project packet at 8:10 p.m.

Chair Ransom resumed the public comments session and asked if there were further questions from the public at 8:21 p.m. There were none, so Chair Ransom closed the public hearing and asked if the Commissioners had further questions.

Commissioner Orcutt asked for clarification about the revision C4.1. Mr. Mina provided clarification. Commissioner Orcutt then asked about the status of Lot 36 in the project. Mr. Mina provided clarification.

Chair Ransom expressed her thanks for allowing the Commissioners time to review the revisions and requested if there were further questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson advised of his professional status adding that he felt he could be fair and impartial. He then made a motion to that the Planning Commission recommend that City Council take the following actions, subject to the conditions and based on the findings contained in the Planning Commission Resolution dated July 24, 2013:

1. Approve a rezone from Low Density Residential to Planned Unit Development for a 47.1-acre parcel located at the southeast corner of Corral Hollow Road and Kagehiro Drive, Assessor's Parcel Number 242-040-36, known as Kagehiro Phase 3, Application Number PUD13-0001;
2. Approve a Concept, Preliminary and Final Development Plan for Kagehiro Phase 3, a 252-lot residential subdivision, Application Number PUD13-0001; and
3. Approve a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for Kagehiro Phase 3, a 252-lot residential subdivision, Application Number TSM12-0001.

And also the memorandum dated July 24, 2013 with the amended conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Orcutt seconded; all in favor, none opposed.

**B. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN APPLICATION TO AMEND A VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP ON AN 18.6-ACRE PARCEL TO CREATE 105 LOTS, AND A PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP/FDP) AMENDMENT TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 105 SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES LOCATED WITHIN THE 18.6 ACRE INFILL SITE ON THE WEST SIDE OF MAC ARTHUR DRIVE, NORTH OF VALPICO ROAD. THE APPLICANT IS VALLEY OAK PARTNERS AND OWNERS ARE DERONE W. AND D.A THRASHER- APPLICATION NUMBERS TSM13-0002 AND Planned Unit Development13-0002**

Chair Ransom reviewed agenda item 2B and called for a staff report. Victoria Lombardo, Senior Planner introduced the project stating that the project was not a new vesting tentative subdivision map, but an amendment to an existing vesting tentative subdivision map which had been approved by City Council in March of 2007. She advised there had been a number of automatic extensions. Valley Oak partners is the current developer amending the project to 105 lots to accommodate a new product type.

Ms. Lombardo advised that the street layout is substantially consistent with the originally approved project and reviewed the site plan. She suggested that overall the project was a Single Family Home subdivision that was originally zoned Low Density Residential and which was rezoned to a Planned Unit Development in 2007.

Ms. Lombardo advised that this project provided for the future needs of the residents by accommodating possible modifications of future owners. She reviewed the variety of floor plans and elevations which would meet the Design Goals and Standards. She added that because the project is already a vesting map that that is to be amended, these are vested into the 2005 growth management ordinance and guidelines.

She provided an overview of parks and schools advising that the project was not of a size to support a school site or parks and that the developer had worked out an MOU with Tracy Unified School District and the City of Tracy to pay in lieu fees.

Ms. Lombardo reviewed a letter that had been given to her prior to the Commission meeting from a resident of Ashley Park Subdivision, Sam Muaddi. She advised that the letter requested only single story homes adjacent to his home and that the resident and the developer had reached an agreement which offered three single story homes. Mr. Muaddi also voiced concerns about a potential grade difference between his property and the proposed project.

Staff recommended that Planning Commission approve the proposal from the developer as written in the packet based on conditions as presented. The agreement discussed between Mr. Muaddi and the developer is not to be included in this project as a condition of approval.

Chair Ransom brought it back to the Commission at 8:40 p.m. Commissioner Orcutt advised that he lives 514 feet from the property, just to advise the commission.

Commissioner Mitracos asked about the grade difference. Ms. Lombardo advised there would not be any significant grade difference and stated that the grading plan showed that there would be a difference of no more than six inches where the project is adjacent to the Ashley Park subdivision. He then commented that the agreement with the developer relative to the properties adjacent to Mr. Muaddi should not be codified.

Chair Ransom questioned the agreement siting that Design Goals and Standards call for a certain amount of variety and she wondered if this agreement would meet that requirement. Ms. Lombardo reviewed the requirements for the commission and advised that it would meet that goal. She also added that developers need to respond to the market demands while still adhering to the standards.

Ransom then asked about privacy issues with the second story houses will stare into the lower elevations. Ms. Lombardo advised that the foot print of a two story will have a smaller foot print therefore a greater set back, thus somewhat alleviating this issue.

Chair Ransom then asked about traffic impacts inquiring if any studies had been done to determine the impact of this project. Mr. Mina advised the developer would do multiple final maps and discussed the variations that would be possible. Ms. Ransom mentioned that there might be more outlets onto the two main arteries. Mr. Mina gave some examples of how the developer might map their lots to offset this situation.

Mr. Dean advised that any project must meet engineering and City standards and stated that this project was considered to be in compliance. Chair Ransom then asked if the traffic from this project was considered along with the impact of the MacDonald and Valpico Apartment projects. Mr. Mina advised that this project is likely to build out before the apartment projects and therefore much of the traffic issue would be addressed.

Chair Ransom requested further information as to when the additional outlets or access points would the developer be required to open. Mr. Mina suggested it would depend on the economy, but that the need would be required once a certain threshold of houses built is met.

Commissioner Mitracos asked about the remainder parcels at the North West corner of the site. Ms. Lombardo advised that when this area was rezoned in 2007 the out parcels were also rezoned.

Commissioner Mitracos asked about Residential Growth Allotments adding that because this project is infill how would they be prioritized. Lombardo advised that the City Council allowed the City of Tracy to go up to the RHNA numbers. She added that there are enough available that will more than cover for the next two to three years.

Chair Ransom opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to speak at 9:03 p.m.

Doug Rich, with Valley Oak Partners, was the applicant and indicated that this was the first community for which they are applying in Tracy advising that they wish to have a long term relationship in the City of Tracy. He summarized the project touching on the fact that it was an existing approved project that they examined to allow for a better fit in the present community.

Chair Ransom invited other attendees to speak.

Sam Muaddi, the property owner requested single story homes adjacent to his existing property spoke. He advised that his residence sits ten feet from the fence line. He provided examples of multiple single story homes that are in proximity to one another throughout the City of Tracy. He also stated that he was satisfied with the private agreement reached between himself and the developer that stated they would build three single-story houses adjacent to his residence.

Douglas Gonsalves, 2455 South MacArthur, a local resident who lives on one of the out-parcels of the project spoke to the Commission. Mr. Gonsalves remarked about the location of single story homes, and asked about the grading of a lot adjacent to his home. He then expressed some concern about access to his home due both to a utility pole at the end of his drive and the speed with which people drive on South MacArthur. He asked how he might go about getting an access driveway off of Deronne Drive. Ms. Lombardo suggested adding a curb cut for temporary access and Mr. Mina advised of a possible location for it. Mr. Gonsalves was asked to come in to City Hall to investigate this possibility and issues about sound walls.

There was a general discussion about traffic on South MacArthur Drive and the turn lanes.

Chair Ransom closed public hearing at 9:25 p.m. and asked the Commission if they had further discussion.

Commissioner Orcutt asked about the remainder lot and how fees would be handled in the future. Ms. Lombardo advised that fees would be applied at that future date.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he has worked with the engineer and that he could remain fair and impartial. He met with applicant and felt he addressed his concerns. Commissioner Johnson asked about the connection with Valpico. Mr. Mina advised that the new road would allow for access to the property. Commissioner Johnson suggested that would be the key to make this work.

Commissioner Mitracos asked about the status of the Valpico and MacDonald Apartment project and was advised by Ms. Lombardo that it might go forward early 2014.

Commissioner Orcutt moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the amendment to the Tiburon Village Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Application Number TSM13-0002, and the amendment to the Preliminary and Final Development Plans, Application Number PUD13-0002, based on the findings and subject to the conditions contained in the Planning Commission Resolution (Attachment E) dated July 24, 2013. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Johnson; all in favor, none opposed.

3. **ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE** Mr. Muaddi asked advised that he had a home on South MacAruther and was advised to speak to staff at City Hall.

4. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**A. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA PACKET DELIVERY**

Mr. Dean reviewed the present level of administrative staffing in Development Services and the issues relating to the delivery of the Planning Commission packet. He added that based on the results of a formal desk audit which was performed that recommended that Planning Commission begin to pick up the packets at City Hall.

Mr. Dean's request met with some opposition from Commissioner Mitracos indicating he would not make that transition. Commissioner Orcutt advised that his packet is mailed which works well for him. Chair Ransom advised that she was opposed to printing the packet. Not completely objecting to picking it up, but said she is very busy. Mr. Dean advised that the packet would be ready no later than 3:00 p.m. on Thursdays.

Commissioner Johnson offered to deliver the packets. Commissioner Sangha said she would also help deliver it. There was a general discussion about the timing of the information being available. Mr. Dean advised that Commissioners would be advised when the packets are ready via email and that if a packet has not been picked up staff will contact the commissioner.

Mr. Sartor advised the Commissioners to be aware of any Brown Act violations when delivering packets to one another.

Mr. Dean thanked the Planning Commission for agreeing to a special meeting on Cordes Ranch on Tuesday July 30, 2013 and asked that Commissioners contact him and ask him any questions. Commissioner Johnson asked if there were changes which Mr. Dean clarified.



5. ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION Commissioner Mitracos discussed the foreclosure crisis.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Orcutt moved to adjourn at 9:50 p.m.

---

CHAIR

---

STAFF LIAISON

DRAFT

**MINUTES**  
**TRACY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**WEDNESDAY, July 30, 2013**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**CITY OF TRACY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**333 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA**

**CALL TO ORDER** Chair Ransom called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Chair Ransom led the pledge of allegiance

**ROLL CALL** Roll Call found Chair Ransom, Vice Chair Sangha, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Mitracos, and Commissioner Orcutt. Also present were staff members Andrew Malik, Director of Development Services, Bill Dean, Assistant Director Development Services, Scott Claar, Kuldeep Sharma, Senior Engineer, Associate Planner, Bill Sartor, Assistant City Attorney and Jan Couturier, Recording Secretary.

**MINUTES APPROVAL** – None

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT REGARDING THIS AGENDA** – None

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE** – None

1. **OLD BUSINESS** – None

2. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL ON CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE CORDES RANCH DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, CORDES RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN, AND CORDES RANCH SITE ANNEXATION APPLICATIONS, AND TO CONSIDER THE APPLICATIONS FOR A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, CORDES RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN, AND AN AMENDMENT TO VARIOUS TRACY MUNICIPAL CODE SECTIONS TO CREATE THE CORDES RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN ZONE DISTRICT, AND PREZONING AND ANNEXATION OF THE CORDES RANCH SITE TO THE CITY OF TRACY. THIS IS ALSO A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH PROLOGIS, LP. THE CORDES RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN SITE IS APPROXIMATELY 1783 ACRES LOCATED NORTH OF SCHULTE ROAD, SOUTH OF I-205, AND EAST AND WEST OF MT HOUSE PARKWAY, APPLICATION NUMBERS GPA13-0002, A/P13-0001. APPLICANT IS DAVID BABCOCK AND ASSOCIATES. THE PROPERTY SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IS APPROXIMATELY 1238 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED NORTH OF SCHULTE ROAD AND EAST OF MOUNTAIN HOUSE PARKWAY, APPLICATION NUMBER DA11-0001; THE APPLICANT IS PROLOGIS, LP.**

Chair Ransom reviewed agenda item 2A and requested a staff report. Mr. Dean introduced the staff and consultants. He then provided some additional background about the reason for the special meeting. He reviewed the packet advising that it was essentially the same as the July 10, 2013 report with some additions and changes. He provided a summary of the

changes to the final Environmental Impact Report and the Development Agreement. He explained that because the Cordes Ranch project was so substantial it took this type of fine tuning and adjustment; he then discussed the reasons for these adjustments. Mr. Dean offered detail on the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan and one of the exhibits to the California Environmental Quality Act document.

Chair Ransom asked if the changes to the Development Agreement were included in the new packet which Mr. Dean acknowledged.

Mr. Dean continued with his opening remarks which explained the packet, the revisions and various attachments. He advised that the Development Agreement did not cover the entire project, just 1,200 acres. He added that this was a jobs development project that would bring manufacturing, office uses to bring jobs to Tracy which will provide an opportunity to for the City of Tracy to develop infrastructure. He added that Prologis would provide monies upfront to help with the wastewater plant expansion; and they are providing an enhanced community benefit fee to be used at the City Council's discretion.

Commissioner Mitracos asked if the Development Agreement could be discussed at the end of the meeting to which Mr. Dean agreed.

Steve Noack of the Planning Center, DC&E, provided a presentation about the process involved in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Reports. He advised that Attachment A in the packet included a sheet with the changes. He reviewed the proposed project components including General Commercial, General Office, Business Park Industrial and Open Park Space. He commented on project alternatives, reduced density alternatives, mixed use alternatives which included residential and also a reconfigured Specific Plan boundary alternative. Mr. Nowak summarized the public comments received and added that the document provided responses to these comments.

Mr. Dean then advised that staff requested the Planning Commission to recommend to the City Council to certify the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, make findings of fact, findings related to alternatives, adopt a statement of overriding considerations, and adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program approve a General Plan Amendment, approve the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan, approve an amendment to the Tracy Municipal Code to add the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan Zone, and approve annexation of the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan site to the City of Tracy, including rezoning, and approve a development agreement with Prologis, LP for lands they own within the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan area.

Chair Ransom requested the presentation from the developer before opening the public hearing. She also asked that the Commissioners be allowed a break to review the recent changes adding that the Commissioners may wish to separate the Development Agreement from the Environmental Impact Report when making a decision indicating it was important for the commission to get it right.

There was some discussion among the commissioners as to the next course of action. Chair Ransom opened the public hearing at 6:31 p.m.

Dan Letter with Prologis introduced the owners and presenters. He made some opening remarks about the process involved in developing the Cordes Ranch Project. He thanked City Staff for their support and hard work and indicated he felt the project would be a major change for the City of Tracy.

Dave Babcock reviewed the Specific plan for Cordes Ranch; the standards and guidelines and provided a PowerPoint presentation which gave an overview of the location of the project, the zoning districts, the potential build-out of the project, the process of testing the plan, the guiding principles; he discussed the amount of review and revision that went into the Specific Plan. He summarized the I-205 Corridor and how it would incorporate the standards and design guidelines of the industrial side of the project as well as landscape and streetscape to allow for consistent quality.

Scott Claar presented a change to the height of the light poles in the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan can be approved up to a height of 60 feet upon approval of a Conditional Use Permit that would be a separate application.

Chair Ransom returned the meeting to the Commission at 6:50 p.m. for questions of the applicant. Commissioner Johnson asked about the changes to the draft Environmental Impact Report specifically as it related to the Patterson Pass Interchange. Mr. Dean then reviewed why the original Planning Commission meeting of July 10, 2013 was postponed; to engage with Caltrans, Mountain House and other agencies which expressed concern and indicated that it allowed for a process of clarification.

Steve Noack and Ellen Polling reviewed the traffic interchanges and the adjustments made to the Mitigation Measures. Ms. Polling provided an overview of the changes to the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan advising that a greater review of the interchanges was performed to determine what would be needed if the development would take more than 25 years for the long term nature of the full build out of both Cordes Ranch and Mountain House. Commissioner Johnson asked if this review was a worst case analysis and Ms. Polling advised that it was

Commissioner Orcutt asked what caused 300 acres to be the trigger point. Mr. Sharma responded that it was a judgment call and that 300 acres would be a minimal impact which appeared to be a good threshold. Commissioner Mitracos asked what type of development was to be expected at that point of Mountain House build out. Mr. Malik responded it would be mixed use, but on a smaller scale.

Chair Ransom asked for clarification of the level of service with mitigations for levels C and D. Ms. Polling indicated only one mitigation provided level D service. Chair Ransom asked about the current level of service; which Ms. Polling indicated was level D.

Commissioner Mitracos asked for clarification about who was responsible for the 580 and Patterson Pass interchanges; specifically asking about the cost. Ms. Polling indicated it was to be shared between the various participants. Mr. Malik advised that the fees were included in the Master Plans.

Commissioner Orcutt asked what the expectation of the Phase I build out would be. Ms. Polling indicated that Phase I would be about 1/3 of the traffic impact.

Mr. Nowak then reviewed Mitigation Measure Hydro 2D discussing the net increase in storm water flow from Patterson Run and the Specific Plan's Watershed area. As a Condition of Approval the applicant would participate in a fair share fee agreement. He also reviewed Mitigation Measure 2E which would require onsite drainage until final build out.

Chair Ransom asked if the Commissioners had any further questions. Seeing none, she asked about the final agricultural agreement. She noted that the proposal specifies that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to prime agricultural land. She then asked about Air Quality Index 2.A, asking if there would be a new application for each phase. Mr. Dean advised that whenever a development application is given, it will be routed to the various districts involved. It would be on a project by project basis. She asked about the Air Quality Index Measures adding that the review it didn't talk about the Air Quality Index Measure levels and the necessary mitigation. Mr. Noack advised that the district would review this and would determine the significance of the relative hazards of the particulate matter.

Commissioner Orcutt asked if the Mountain House concerns were being addressed. Mr. Dean advised that Fire Safety had not yet been addressed.

Seeing no more questions from the Commissioners, Chair Ransom advised the Public Hearing was still open.

Morgan Groover the Planning Director of Mountain House addressed the commission indicating that he felt the staff had addressed most of the issues for Mountain House. He reviewed the last issue of concern which was the traffic interchange at Mountain House Parkway. He advised that Mountain House had paid for the entire interchange and suggested that this project would take land away from Mountain House. He provided a letter to the Planning Commission outlining his concerns, the fiscal impact to Mountain House as well as the agreement that was approved by LAFCO. He added that he felt the California Environmental Quality Act document was deficient if there are impacts that have not been addressed.

Commissioner Mitracos asked when the finance agreement with LAFCO was made. Mr. Groover advised that it had been done in 1993. Commissioner Mitracos asked how much area was affected. Mr. Gruber advised that it might be from 1 to 10 acres that would be affected.

Chair Ransom asked if Mr. Gruber had spoken to the developer. Mr. Groover advised that he would like the same mitigation given to Mountain House as is being given to Tracy.

Commissioner Sangha asked if this was the only concern of Mountain House. Mr. Groover advised that it was.

Commissioner Orcutt requested clarification about from which agency Mountain House was requesting mitigation. Mr. Groover advised that it should be the developer.

Rick Woodward, addressed the Commission and indicated he was a partner in property at the South West quadrant of the Mountain House I205 interchange being addressed by Mr. Groover. He advised that the North East quadrant of the interchange would likely be the most affected by an interchange and that this property was not a part of Mountain House. He stated that he and his partners, as well as the owner of the South East property at the interchange, were requested to "gift" their properties by Mountain House; which they did free and clear. He added that they would all be required to pay their fair share of the development fees.

Attorney Anne Embry addressed the Commission on behalf of Horizon Planet. She submitted a letter written to the City of Tracy stating several concerns which she then read. Among the issues she reviewed were those of urban decay, the Environmental Impact Report

deficiencies, greenhouse gas emissions and concerns that had been raised in the past relative to the PG&E gas line that runs through the project. She requested Planning Commission not recommend approval of the project.

Chair Ransom asked if these comments were previously submitted during public hearings. Ms. Embry advised that these comments had not been presented. Mr. Dean advised that staff had not received a letter and that staff had done outreach to Horizon Planet, but had not received any input.

Commissioner Mitracos asked if the City of Tracy had an Agricultural mitigation fee. Mr. Dean advised yes.

Seeing no further comments, Chair Ransom closed public hearing at 7:51p.m.

Chair Ransom asked how significant were the changes to the documents that were provided at the time of the meeting. Mr. Dean advised they were clarifications.

Commissioner Mitracos and Chair Ransom asked if these were simply word changes. Mr. Dean advised that they were.

Ransom requested a 25 minute break at 7:55 p.m.

Chair Ransom brought the meeting back to order at 8:22 p.m. and re-opened the public hearing with no comments. She then asked for further staff comment.

Mr. Noack reviewed the issues brought to the Commission by the attorney for Horizon Planet relative to urban decay.

- He summarized the response in the Environmental Impact Report stating that the proposed project was evaluated in the Cordes Specific Plan and it was determined that the project did not present an urban decay issue under California Environmental Quality Act.
- He also responded to the issue of impact to Agricultural Lands indicating that as part of the Development Agreement the applicable mitigation fees will be paid by the developer in compliance with Chapter 13.28 of the Tracy Municipal Code; this fee to be collected at the time development projects are submitted.
- He further advised that the Draft Environmental Impact Report provided very specific compliance requirements which referred to the City of Tracy Sustainability Action Plan and was evaluated against California Attorney General Reduction Strategies.

Chair Ransom requested clarification on where these responses were located in the packet. Noack indicated they were in the draft Environmental Impact Report.

- He discussed that the Urban Heat Island affect advising it was not a specific requirement of California Environmental Quality Act.
- He noted that the gas lines safety issue was addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report; a pipeline hazards analysis; the conclusions were that the pipelines are adequate and are similar to other areas within the community.

Commissioner Mitracos asked if the Draft Environmental Impact Report related to the City of Tracy Sustainability Action Plan. Mr. Noack said yes. All policies of the plan indicate this project is in keeping with the Sustainability Action Plan.

Mr. Dean commented that Mr. Groover's fears about Mountain House Parkway. Although the fiscal impact on Mountain House appeared to be an area of disagreement Mr. Dean suggested it was not an issue to be discussed at this time as this meeting was a review of the Environmental Impact Report, not fiscal impacts. He further added that Mr. Groover's concerns would be more appropriate some time in the future and that the outcome would be difficult to determine at this time. Mr. Malik indicated that staff would continue to work with Mountain House relative to their concerns.

Commissioner Johnson asked about why some of the fiscal issues were addressed in the Draft Environmental Report. Mr. Dean indicated it is common to identify certain mitigation fees, wastewater treatment plant specifically. City of Tracy will collect fees to mitigate various impact issues.

Commissioner Johnson asked if an issue happened before or during the development of a project it would be addressed in the agreement, but this issue is a future issue. Mr. Malik advised that fees would get adjusted depending on right of way.

Orcutt asked if those fees would cover the operational impacts. Andrew Malik advised that the City of Tracy would need to better understand the issues raised by Mountain House.

Chair Ransom opened the issue of the Development Agreement for the Commission to discuss at 8:40 p.m.

Commissioner Orcutt asked if there were no Developer Agreement; how that would affect the development process. Mr. Dean indicated that Developer Agreements are intended to provide protection to both parties. He added that a project of this scale with as much up-front investment as this requires would likely not be feasible. He added that the City could not expect a Developer to proceed without these assurances.

Chair Ransom mentioned that the agreement is a 25 year agreement and can be extended, but she raised a question about the timing of the development noting that there was no specific timeline. She asked if there were any differences between this and any other project where the City of Tracy would expect a timeline. Mr. Dean responded by saying that the market will drive the timeline adding there were too many variables on the private side of a project of this magnitude. He stated that this project would have a very large impact on Tracy and the area; that this will bring jobs to the Tracy and the San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. Malik commented that Prologis was the largest property holder in the Northeast Industrial area; that they helped to bring Amazon to Tracy. He indicated a developer of that status is a critical component to bring tenants to a project of this size; further stating that the City of Tracy was comfortable with the developer and the partnership.

Chair Ransom re-opened the public hearing at 8:46.

Dan Letter of Prologis indicated that Prologis could provide a certainty of delivery. He indicated they built a system that was mindful of attracting big users such as Amazon, Crate & Barrel and Best Buy adding that Prologis owned most of the properties in the Northeast industrial area of Tracy and has been able to use these major businesses to attract more users. He stated that city staff had spent the last 5 years working to show the area that Tracy is serious about business development; that although there was flexibility in the agreement

there were also obligations for Prologis to provide the best business park in Northern California.

Mr. Groover, of Mountain House, rebutted Mr. Dean's comments and indicated that he felt that Tracy should have the developer make Mountain House whole.

Jim Smith, Tracy resident, raised the issue that there was no mention of about local hires in the Development agreement and. He is a millwright. He suggested that he would like to see a requirement for hiring locally.

Bob Tanner, Tracy resident, asked for clarification about the difference between the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report. Mr. Dean provided clarification advising that they are two separate documents.

Chair Ransom closed the public hearing at 8:54 p.m.

Chair Ransom asked about the annexation of property to the City of Tracy and asked how that related to the need for offsite land. Mr. Malik indicated that some or all improvements made for an interchange might be owned by Caltrans adding that the City of Tracy might need to acquire and fund the property which would be dedicated back to Caltrans by the City.

Chair Ransom then asked about Eminent Domain proceedings and what was considered a "reasonable period of time." Mr. Sharma advised that the time period would begin when the project commences. Chair Ransom then asked about what was the timeframe for Due Diligence. Mr. Sharma advised that most agreements take about 3 months. He added that if an impasse is reached, the matter would be brought before City Council for a Resolution of Necessity. Mr. Malik added that with all construction that had happened within the City, Tracy has not used Eminent Domain very often; adding that the City works toward friendly acquisition.

Mr. Sartor, advised that the law requires an attempt to negotiate and that there are timeframes set in the law; that it tends to be flexible and it is dependent on the project needs.

Vice Chair Sangha, asked about value per acre and the cost to Prologis. She asked why it appears that we are providing a discount to Prologis. Mr. Dean provided a summary of the fee structure. Mr. Malik advised that the upfront pricing was discounted, but that the subsequent fees would make up the difference.

Commissioner Mitracos asked about Community Benefit Fee. Mr. Dean indicated that Prologis agreed to pay a fee to benefit the community and that it would be paid over time. City Council would determine how it would be used. Commissioner Mitracos mentioned the payment begins two years after the effective date.

Commissioner Johnson disclosed that he has worked with several of the developers, but that he felt he could be fair and impartial. He then spoke to some of the initial views of Planning Commission. He expressed excitement over the fact that this would be a City of Tracy game changer. He felt staff and the developer had done a good job; that they have proved their commitment to Tracy.

Commissioner Mitracos agreed with Commissioner Johnson stating that the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan was very well done and would change Tracy.



Chair Ransom thanked everyone for their patience while the Commissioners took time to assure they clearly understood everything. She commented that this was a huge opportunity for Economic Development for the City of Tracy.

Vice Chair Sangha commented that she had already received inquiries from 10,000 miles away asking about Tracy development; that they were excited about the project. She added her support of hire local.

Commissioner Orcutt commented that he saw a lot of benefits to the City of Tracy by bringing local jobs to Tracy and improved economic development. He commented that there will be a bit of work to do with Mountain House to improve the fiscal implications of the project.

Commissioner Mitracos moved that the Planning Commission recommends that Planning Commission recommend that the City Council:

- 1) Certify the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan EIR, and make findings of fact, findings related to alternatives, adopt a statement of overriding considerations, and adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program, and
- 2) Approve a General Plan Amendment (application number GPA13-0002), and
- 3) Approve the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan, and
- 4) Approve an amendment to the Tracy Municipal Code Sections 10.08.980 and 10.08.3021 to add the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan Zone (application number ZA13-0001), and
- 5) Approve annexation of the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan site to the City of Tracy, including rezoning (application number A/P13-0001), and
- 6) Approve a development agreement with Prologis, LP for lands they own within the Cordes Ranch Specific Plan area (application number DA-11-0001), and
- 7) Revision to the draft Cordes Ranch Specific Plan, and
- 8) Approving exhibit D, and
- 9) As well as revisions to the Draft Cordes Ranch Specific Plan, and
- 10) The amended Development Agreement, and

Commissioner Johnson noted that the Ordinance for the Development Agreement listed a July 10, 2013 and needed to reflect July 30, 2013.

- 11) Amend the Ordinance for the Development Agreement to reflect July 30, 2013

Commissioner Johnson seconded; all in favor, none opposed.

3. **ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE** - None

5. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT** – none

6. **ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION** – Commissioner Johnson commended Chair Ransom on her management of the meeting. Chair Ransom requested that when items for the meeting are received the day of meeting it makes it very difficult for the Commissioners. Mr. Dean indicated that attempts were made to avoid the last minute changes, but that items of this nature are extraordinary and the City wishes to be business friendly.

7. **ADJOURNMENT** – 9:25 Orcutt made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Mitracos seconded.

---

CHAIR

---

STAFF LIAISON

DRAFT

**MINUTES**  
**TRACY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**WEDNESDAY, August 14, 2013**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**CITY OF TRACY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**333 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA**

**CALL TO ORDER** Chair Ransom called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Chair Ransom led the pledge of allegiance.

**ROLL CALL** Roll Call found Chair Ransom, Vice Chair Sangha, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Mitracos, and Commissioner Orcutt. Also present were staff members Victoria Lombardo, Senior Planner, Kimberly Matlock, Assistant Planner, Bill Sartor, Assistant City Attorney and Jan Couturier, Recording Secretary.

**MINUTES APPROVAL** – None

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT REGARDING THIS AGENDA** – None

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE** – None

1. **OLD BUSINESS** – None

2. **NEW BUSINESS**

**A. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN APPLICATION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR A PLACE OF WORSHIP IN THE EDGEWOOD CORPORATE CENTER LOCATED AT 4600 S. TRACY BOULEVARD, SUITES 101, 111, 113, and 115. APPLICANT IS SCHACK AND COMPANY, INC. AND PROPERTY OWNERS ARE EDGEWOOD CORPORATE CENTER, LLC. AND MEM DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC. APPLICATION NUMBER CUP13-0005**

Chair Ransom reviewed agenda item 2A and called for the staff report.

Ms. Matlock presented the staff report in which she advised that the proposal was to establish a place of worship (Journey Christian Church) in the Edgewood Corporate Center located at 4600 South Tracy Boulevard, Suites 101, 111, 113, and 115. She added that the Edgewood Corporate Center is an office complex comprised of four condominium buildings and a shared parking lot located within the Industrial Areas Specific Plan area and designated General Industrial. She advised that places of public assembly would be conditionally permitted and would require a Conditional Use Permit granted by the Planning Commission to operate.

She reviewed the space requirements of the applicant including the worship area and classrooms, offices, and other common areas. She provided information on the times of the worship services would be on weekends only with meetings and administrative office hours during the week, indicating there would not be a conflict with the operation of existing tenants.

In a review of the site parking she advised that there was enough available parking on site for the proposed use, which required 103 parking spaces. She said the site contained a total of 453 parking spaces, at a rate greater than 1 parking space per 200 square feet of gross floor area. She commented that this would provide flexibility in the uses that can occupy the site and that the site was primarily occupied by offices which only required 1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor office area.

Ms. Matlock advised that Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the application for a Conditional Use Permit.

Chair Ransom asked if there were any questions or comments from any of the Commissioners. Commissioner Orcutt asked if in the future the church wished to change spaces would the applicant have to come before the PC again. Ms. Matlock advised that the applicants would need to come before Commission for any such changes.

Chair Ransom opened the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Dan Schack, of Schack and Company, represented the applicant. He advised that the summary provided by staff was accurate and that the usage was complementary to the entire facility. He then provided a summary of the application and then advised that Scott McFarland, Journey Christian Church Pastor, was also available. He restated the staff recommendation for the Planning Commission to approve the application

Commissioner Johnson advised the applicant that he had noted information was included about an outdoor play area referenced in the Conditions of Approval as attached to the Resolution. Ms. Matlock advised that this was a typo and referenced an additional typo in staff report. She then advised that the portion of Condition of Approval 2B referring to the outdoor play area should be eliminated from the Condition of Approval.

Chair Ransom asked if there were any further changes to the resolution. Ms. Matlock restated that only the portion referring to outdoor play area in Condition of Approval 2B should be removed from the Conditions of Approval and that any other changes were to the staff report and would not affect the resolution.

Chair Ransom closed the public hearing and then requested comments or questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Johnson said he was glad to see empty buildings being occupied and moved that the Planning Commission approve the application for a Conditional Use Permit for a place of worship in the Edgewood Corporate Center located at 4600 S. Tracy Boulevard, Suites 101, 111, 113, and 115, based on the findings and subject to the conditions as amended and as stated in the Planning Commission Resolution dated August 14, 2013. Commissioner Orcutt seconded, all in favor none opposed.

3. ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE - None
4. DIRECTOR'S REPORT – None
5. ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION – None

6. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Ransom requested a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Orcutt so moved; Commissioner Johnson seconded at 7:15 p.m.

---

CHAIR

---

STAFF LIAISON

DRAFT

**MINUTES  
TRACY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, August 14, 2013  
7:00 P.M.  
CITY OF TRACY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
333 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Ransom called the special meeting to order pursuant to section 549596 of Government Code of the State of California to order at 7:15 p.m.

**ROLL CALL** Roll Call found Chair Ransom, Vice Chair Sangha, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Mitracos, and Commissioner Orcutt. Also present were staff members Victoria Lombardo, Senior Planner, Kimberly Matlock, Assistant Planner, Bill Sartor, Assistant City Attorney and Jan Couturier, Recording Secretary.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT REGARDING THIS AGENDA** – Ms. Lombardo apologized for the late notice and advised of the circumstances. She further mentioned that the meeting did not require a public hearing.

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE** – Robert Tanner addressed the Commission on an item on the agenda and was therefore asked to address the issue at the appropriate time.

**1. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. REPORT ON CONFORMITY WITH THE CITY OF TRACY GENERAL PLAN FOR THE POTENTIAL SALE OF TWO CITY-OWNED PARCELS LOCATED ON WEST SCHULTE ROAD, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS 209-230-29 AND 209-230-30. APPLICATION NUMBER DET13-0003**

Chair Ransom reviewed Agenda Item 1A and called for a staff report. Ms. Matlock presented the staff report and advised of the location of the parcels. She stated that whenever a public agency proposes to acquire or dispose of real property it is required to do a report of conformity with the General Plan.

Ms. Matlock further stated that the subject property was located outside of the City limits, but within the City's Sphere of Influence and that the subject property was designated Park by the City's General Plan. This designation provided for current and future locations of public parks of all sizes. Examples of specific land uses that are appropriate within this designation include alternative energy uses. The potential purchaser, in this case Surland, could pursue a renewable energy or alternative energy project on the property, however, would not be required to do so under the terms of the sale. Therefore, the sale of the property is consistent with the City's General Plan land use designation of Park.

Ms. Matlock concluded that staff recommended that Planning Commission report that the potential sale of the two City-owned parcels located on West Schulte Road, are in conformance with the City of Tracy General Plan, as stated in the Planning Commission Resolution.

Mr. Sartor indicated that the Planning Commission had previously reported on the General Plan Consistency for these parcels, but at that time it was contemplated that the parcels would

only be used for renewable energy. However, as this will be a straight sale, there will not be any such requirements, therefore the request to do an additional report of consistency.

Commissioner Mitracos requested a history of these parcels. Mr. Sartor then provided the background advising that the Federal Government gifted the property to the City of Tracy. As a result of this and through previous legislation deed restrictions required the 150 acres to be used for renewable energy.

Commissioner Orcutt asked for specific information on which parcel had the existing deed restrictions. Mr. Sartor advised that the 150 acre parcel was the parcel that had the deed restrictions. Commissioner Orcutt then asked what the incentive would be for someone to buy either or both based on previous issues with the gas line that runs through the property.

Commissioner Orcutt asked if the public outcry would be any different for future projects. Mr. Sartor advised that this parcel lies in the county and is owned by the City.

Commissioner Mitracos asked when the general plan amendment was made to the use of this parcel. Ms. Lombardo indicated it would have been discussed at either a City Council meeting or Planning Commission meeting. She then reviewed solar farm usage. Commissioner Mitracos expressed discomfort with not having all the information.

Commissioner Orcutt asked if under the terms of the sale, the zoning could be changed. Mr. Sartor indicated that zoning would be up to the county unless it was annexed into the City.

Commissioner Mitracos asked what that the Planning Commission was specifically being asked to do. Mr. Sartor advised that there is a need to report on the consistency with the General Plan. Chair Ransom indicated it appeared that this was more of a formality. Not really looking at the conformity

Mr. Sartor advised that any time land is sold that is in the city's sphere of influence a report on whether or not it conforms is required; not a report on whether or not it does conform.

Commissioner Orcutt expressed concern about what would happen from a planning perspective as more people moved into the south end of town with more development; would the City need to go purchase more parcels to create a large park. There was a general discussion about the county being responsible for zoning the property.

Chair Ransom opened the public hearing at 7:35 p.m. Mr. Tanner addressed the Commission and asked what the city originally paid for the parcels. Mr. Sartor did not know.

Commissioner Orcutt asked if that information would be available at City Council. Mr. Sartor advised that it would be public record. There followed a general discussion about whether the City would make a profit on the sale.

Chair Ransom requested further clarification on exactly what PC was being charged with doing. Mr. Sartor advised that staff's recommendation was that it was in conformance because it was just changing ownership.

Chair Ransom closed the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

The Commission held a general discussion about future use of these parcels as a park and it was determined that would be unlikely. Mr. Sartor advised that the solar use had not been ruled out; it is just not a requirement.

Ms. Lombardo discussed issues with the county's general plan and suggested the county might be considering other uses; specifically agricultural for these parcels.

Commissioner Orcutt made a motion that the Planning Commission report that the potential sale of the two City-owned parcels located on West Schulte Road, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 209-230-29 and 209-230-30 is in conformance with the City of Tracy General Plan, as stated in the Planning Commission Resolution dated August 14, 2013. Vice Chair Sangha seconded the motion, all in favor, none opposed.

2. ADJOURNMENT - Commissioner Orcutt moved to adjourn at 7:48 p.m.

---

CHAIR

---

STAFF LIAISON



September 11, 2013

AGENDA ITEM 2A

REQUEST

**APPOINT A PLANNING COMMISSIONER TO THE SENIOR STEERING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION

At the July 2, 2013 City Council meeting, staff presented to Council an outline of a potential formation of a Senior Advisory Commission and two additional alternatives for consideration. Through discussions between Council members and receiving comments from the public during the meeting, Council directed staff to explore the formation of a Senior Steering Committee that would facilitate a series of community conversations with the public. At the August 20, 2013 City Council meeting, Council approved the formation of a Senior Steering Committee to include appointing one Commissioner from each of the following City of Tracy Commissions: Parks and Community Services Commission, Planning Commission, Tracy Arts Commission and Transportation Commission. Additionally three seniors at large from the Tracy community would be appointed by City Council. Attachment A outlines the Tracy Senior Steering Committee guidelines and proposed timeline.

The Senior Steering Committee would work together with a facilitator in a community conversation setting, to identify and discuss current and future service needs for seniors in the Tracy community. This forum would provide the opportunity for seniors and community stakeholders, to identify issues that are of importance to the seniors in the Tracy community. The series of meetings will allow seniors to voice their opinions on issues that impact them directly. Additionally, the City of Tracy would be proactive in planning for the future needs of our local senior population. The Senior Steering Committee will determine the actual dates and times of the forums.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission appoint a Planning Commissioner to the Senior Steering Committee.

MOTION

Move that the Planning Commission appoint a Commissioner to the Senior Steering Committee.

Prepared by: Jolene Jauregui, Recreation Coordinator II  
Kim Scarlata, Recreation Services Program Manager

Reviewed by: Bill Dean, Development Services Assistant Director

Approved by: Andrew Malik, Development Services Director

Attachment A: Tracy Senior Steering Committee Guidelines

## **TRACY SENIOR STEERING COMMITTEE GUIDELINES**

### **PURPOSE:**

The Tracy Senior Steering Committee is to receive input from seniors in the community on current and future needs of senior citizens and provide feedback to the Parks and Community Services Commission and the City Council.

### **RESPONSIBILITIES INCLUDE:**

1. Host two Community Conversations to invite the following members of the Tracy Community: seniors, caregivers, stakeholders and members of the public.
2. Receive input from the senior citizen community, including input from other individuals and organizations on issues relevant to current and future needs of the seniors.
3. Provide feedback to the Parks and Community Services Commission and City Council on the assessment of current and future needs of the senior citizen community.

### **MEMBERSHIP GUIDELINES:**

The Tracy Senior Steering Committee shall consist of one appointed Commissioner from each of the following City of Tracy Commissions: Parks and Community Services Commission, Planning Commission, Tracy Arts Commission and Transportation Commission. Additionally, three seniors at large from the Tracy community would be appointed by City Council that meet the following qualifications.

1. Minimum age requirement of 55 years (Optional)
2. Currently work or have experience working in a senior related field (Optional)
3. Have the ability to take an active role in meetings
4. Be a resident of the City of Tracy

Appointment to the Tracy Senior Steering Committee positions is voluntary.

### **COMMUNITY CONVERSATION MEETINGS:**

1. Two Community Conversation meetings will be held.
2. A facilitator will lead the discussion during the timed meetings.
3. The facilitator will compile results from the two Community Conversations.
4. The facilitator will work with staff and members of the Tracy Senior Steering Committee to prepare a report and presentation to the Parks and Community Services Commission and City Council at a joint meeting.

**STAFFING AND FISCAL IMPACTS:**

Using various media outlets, staff will market the two community conversations at locations including the Lolly Hansen Senior Center and other locations where seniors gather. Marketing efforts will also include reaching out to non-profits and other organizations that provide services to seniors.

It is anticipated that there will be no additional expenses beyond the cost of facilitator services authorized by Council. Staff will coordinate required meeting logistics and provide support as needed to the facilitator with respect to the development of related staff reports.

**TIMELINE:**

Below is a tentative timeline for the formation of a Tracy Senior Steering Committee:

TASK	DATE
Staff begins to prepare documents necessary to recruit members of the Tracy Senior Steering Committee	Aug 26, 2013
Recruitment will begin and it will follow the process of other City of Tracy recruitments	Aug 28, 2013
Applications due to the Clerk's office	Sep 18, 2013
Interviews	Oct 2013
Appointments to the Tracy Senior Steering Committee made by City Council	Oct 15, 2013
First Town Hall meeting	Oct 28, 2013
Second Town Hall meeting	Nov 18, 2013
Prepare report and presentation	Dec 2013 & Jan 2014
Provide feedback to the Parks and Community Services Commission at City Council at a joint special meeting	Jan 21, 2014