

**BELLEVUE CORRIDOR COMMUNITY PLAN
AD-HOC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MINUTES

SAM PIPES CONFERENCE ROOM
678 W. 18TH STREET
MERCED, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 1, 2012

(A) CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson SPRIGGS called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

(B) ROLL CALL

Present: Committee Members:

Jerry Callister
Susan Gerhardt
Sharon Hunt Dicker
Dan Holmes
Lee Kolligian
Kenneth Robbins
Steve Simmons
Justi Smith
Bill Spriggs
Steve Tinetti
Mary Ward
Janet Young

Absent: Committee Members:

Melbourne Gwin, Jr. (excused)
Dan Hong (unexcused)
Richard Kirby (excused)
Walt Lopes (excused)
Jeff Pennington (excused)
Greg Thompson (excused)
Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo (excused)

Staff Present:

Bill King, Principal Planner
Julie Sterling, Associate Planner

Consultants Present:

Lisa Wise
Ben Sigman

Colin Burgett

Tony Perez

(C) INNOVATION HUB

Principal Planner KING provided a brief overview of what is meant by an Innovation Hub and its relationship to the Bellevue Corridor Community Plan (BCCP). He introduced Geneva SKRAM, Coordinator for ReCCES, who explained what the Resource Center for Community Engaged Scholarship is all about. Several UC Merced Students and Dr. S.A. DAVIS gave presentations on “Innovation Hubs.”

(Secretary’s Note: This part of the Meeting was in the City Council Chambers.)

(D) MEETING BREAK

A break was taken at 2:20 p.m. and the meeting reconvened in the Sam Pipes Room at 2:35 p.m.

(E) APPROVE MINUTES OF AUGUST 23, 2012

M/S WARD-YOUNG and carried by unanimous voice vote (seven absent), to approve the Minutes of October 4, 2012, as submitted.

(F) ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Sid Lakireddy commented about the Urban Village Concept Plan.

(G) ECONOMIC STUDY MEMORANDUM

The consultant, LISA WISE, provided an overview of the project, public outreach to date, future meetings, and project challenges and opportunities, such as connecting UC Merced with downtown.

BEN SIGMAN, Economic & Planning Systems (EPS), discussed the Draft Economic Analysis Technical Memorandum, providing background information to assist in the effort to craft and consider land use alternatives. He first discussed Merced’s market housing realities in permitting, inventory, home values, home pricing, and various population projections. He noted that it could be decades to absorb the inventory. He stated that a significant question before the community is deciding where to grow,

which is determined in part by the availability of infrastructure and environmental permitting issues. He noted that several public entities involved (county, city, and LAFCO) need to have a common vision and understanding to facilitate growth.

Mr. SIGMAN discussed the competitive position of the City in the Central Valley due to presence of UC Merced, potential high-speed rail station, recreational uses, natural resources and shopping facilities. He then discussed the competitive position of the BCCP planning area, stating that: 1) the BCCP builds on the natural pattern of growth by filling-in between the City and UC Merced; 2) the BCCP includes large parcels which are easier to develop than assembling many small ones; 3) the BCCP has sewer and water infrastructure which will lower the costs of future growth; and 4) proximity to the UC Merced Campus. Mr. SIGMAN noted, however, that significant planning for the University Community Plan (UCP) has occurred, and that the northern part of this planning area was scaled to capture spin-off development from UCM (See comment from Committee Member YOUNG later in minutes).

Mr. SIGMAN pointed out that UCM is a driver of development, and the highest value sites are going to be located closer to UCM. He also noted that the pace of growth at UCM will govern the rate and opportunity for development nearby; therefore it is advantageous for the community as a whole to support growth at UCM.

BEN SIGMAN then discussed Research and Development. He stated that UCM affords opportunity to develop an innovation hub, and referenced the previous presentation by UCM students and professor S.A. Davis. In coming up with a recommendation on the amount of R&D space near UCM that should be planned for, EPS looked at three comparative sites including UC Davis (500,000 square feet of R&D), UC Riverside (2.7 million square feet of R&D), and UC Irvine (no amount stated). Mr. SIGMAN stated that 5 million square feet of floor area of R&D is the EPS recommendation to plan for in the area around UCM. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN inquired as to whether EPS looked at a 20-year projection and what numbers to expect. Mr. SIGMAN stated that the figures were based on today's economic values and did not project out. Committee Member YOUNG noted that the entire UCP, not just the northern part, was drafted to minimize impacts. She also asked about sewer capacity of the Bellevue line and what improvements would be needed to serve the area. Mr. SIGMAN noted that there is insufficient capacity to serve the area and UCP, but has not figured the degree of improvements needed. Chairperson SPRIGGS emphasized that the available and affordable land in the area would generate growth faster than forecasted. Mr. SIGMAN agreed, also stating that this factor could draw in R&D to the area compared with other built-out cities.

Committee Member HOLMES noted that the City of Merced's traditional growth patterns have been to annex/develop adjacent to the City, but if the demand is to grow adjacent to UCM, then the annex/growth could be backwards, i.e. starting at UCM instead of "G" Street in an east to west direction. He also noted that the City's future sewer master plan needs to address several "downstream" infrastructure deficiencies to provide service to the planning area. Mr. SIGMAN stated that on a macro scale, annexing the BCCP between the City and UCM continues the City's pattern of filing-in as it expands, consistent with LAFCO interests. Committee Member ROBBINS noted that transportation costs are also a significant factor in urban growth of the area.

A member of the public inquired as to the use of the economic study. Ms. WISE said the study provides data on possible amount of R&D, which is then used to construct part of the land use plan. Mr. SPAUR expressed interest to begin to model land use patterns based on the economic development data.

(H) MEETING BREAK

A break was taken from 3:15 to 3:27 p.m.

(I) TRANSPORTATION MEMORANDUM

COLIN BURGETT presented transportation topics including: 1) transit-oriented development, transit-adjacent development (land uses adjacent but not supportive of transit); CEQA-exempt transit priority projects; transit service types (bus rapid transit and rapid bus service); "M" Street transitway; direct alignment efficiencies and transit route options. Mr. BURGETT noted that Bellevue Road, as an expressway, is not conducive to a walkable transit corridor. He also suggested that a transit corridor parallel Bellevue Road. He noted that R&D is generally not transit-oriented and could be sited more to the north. Mr. BURGETT then discussed traffic volumes, describing the one-mile arterial street grid; the City's bikeway network; and the forecasted *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* traffic volumes, and associated 4-6 lane high-volume arterials. Mr. BURGETT suggested to disperse traffic using other roads (1/2-mile arterials or 1/4-mile "mixed-use" collectors) so that Bellevue Road near UCM only needs to be four lanes, not six. He concluded with visuals of various street cross-sections of street designs and options for autos, bikes, buses, and pedestrians.

A member of the public inquired about the use of Parsons/Gardener in the planning effort. Mr. BURGETT noted that consultant will look at the function of this road. Committee Member YOUNG inquired if there is still a plan to connect the AME with the Campus Parkway. Mr. KING noted that Bellevue Road has and is planned to operate as an urban arterial, not an expressway. Committee Member YOUNG also noted that the campus parkway alignment shown in images by the consultant are incorrect. Committee Member ROBBINS stated that the odds of "M" Street crossing Bellevue Road are zero due to wetland issues.

TONY PEREZ presented a conceptual model of City parts that if addressed correctly, could help to implement master plans such as the BCCP. These parts include: 1) Neighborhoods (urban residential, neighborhood residential, and rural residential); 2) Districts (R&D and assembling); 3) Centers (regional, community and neighborhood retail centers); and, 4) Corridors (urban, neighborhood, and rural). Mr. PEREZ discussed these parts as they could apply to the BCCP, using a series of slides depicting conceptual locations of R&D sites, which would then influence the siting of centers, then corridors, then neighborhoods.

Committee Member KOLLIGIAN thought that the location of multiple centers to service the university was a good idea, and inquired about planned uses north of Bellevue Road. Mr. PEREZ noted that the uses would be less intense than uses located south of Bellevue Road. Committee Member HOLMES noted that the plan to extend Parsons/Gardner to Bellevue Road has been in the City's general plan for a long-time, and that this future alignment supports some of the R&D concept locations shown. A member of the public inquired if there is a plan to make Bellevue an expressway. Ms. WISE stated they are not supportive of this idea, rather to design it more like a boulevard. Another member of the public noted that if you have a wide boulevard, then land uses on both sides capable of paying for such road would be needed. Committee Member DICKER questioned the placement of a center ¼ mile from centers in the UCP. Ms. WISE noted the center could be small, and emphasized the presented images are conceptual and not written in stone. Committee Member GERHARDT noted that the consultant's presentation did not talk much about bikes, and that bikeways need to be included in the plan. Committee Member YOUNG expressed a need to allow for uses that cannot be contemplated today, and that the plan should allow for new technologies in waste water treatment and water conservation. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN, speaking about the land use concepts, was impressed because low-density was de-emphasized.

NOVEMBER 1, 2012

(J) NEXT STEPS

LISA WISE explained that this is a long-range plan and the objectives need to be flexible, and checked or revisited every 10 years or so. By using the Guiding Principles, and building from comments received from the October 4th meeting and the meeting today, the Team will move forward with preparing some options for the next Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on January 31, 2013.

(K) ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 2013, AT 1:30 P.M.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, CHAIRPERSON SPRIGGS ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 4:42 P.M. TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED BELLEVUE CORRIDOR COMMUNITY PLAN AD-HOC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 2013, AT 1:30 P.M.

BY:



BILL KING
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

APPROVED:



BILL SPRIGGS, CHAIRPERSON
BELLEVUE CORRIDOR COMMUNITY PLAN
AD-HOC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE