



Board of Supervisors Study Session Summary

As part of the San Joaquin County General Plan Update, the Board of Supervisors held a study session on May 24, 2011, to discuss the Update process and review the results of the Focus Group meetings and Community Workshop #3 on the Alternatives Report. The General Plan Consultants, Mintier Harnish, made a presentation regarding the overall General Plan Update process followed by a summary of the feedback received on the Alternatives from the Focus Group members and community members. After the presentation, the Board of Supervisors and the public asked questions and provided comments related to the information presented. These discussions are summarized here.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Ray Hoo, Senior Planner at 209-468-3164 or rhoo@sjgov.org.





BOARD OF SUPERVISORS QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

- There is a lot of support for Alternative B, a more city-centric growth pattern; however, getting the cities to agree to a more compact development pattern will be difficult.
- If we don't allow some growth in unincorporated communities, they will suffer. They are our legacy. Communities need to be allowed to grow and add services.
- It seems like most growth pressure will be north and south of the City of Stockton between and adjacent to I-5 and SR 99.
- If the Delta Secondary Zone becomes more restrictive to development there will be more growth pressure in other unincorporated areas of the County.
- It would be interesting to see more options for employment growth outlined in Alternative C.
- The General Plan is the County's defining document and cities are infringing on County lands. We need to position the County for the long-term and make sure that the County isn't left without any development and related tax revenue.
- Something to consider in the Alternatives discussion is the impact of AB 32 and SB 375.
- The selected alternative needs to support decisions that will be fiscally sound.
- Need to make sure to acknowledge and address land use change requests, especially for smaller property owners.
- The Board would like recommendations from County staff on what should be included in a preferred alternative based on community feedback and the County's interests.
- Confirmed letters from community members and the public received to date.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE ALTERNATIVES:

- The Alternatives process is dodging the real issues that the County needs to deal with: water, educational attainment, transportation systems, keeping citizens here.
- The preferred alternative needs to recognize flexibility for land use. County doesn't have jurisdiction over cities.
- Economic development. There is a strong reason for the County to include policies to address economic/workforce development. The Plan should allow employment growth anywhere that meets the location criteria and service standards of the County.
- Need to recognize that a large number of people like to live in rural areas. Need to have policies to allow for some form of rural residential expansion. Urban communities may want to grow outwards or it may happen anyway.
- Would like to extend the rural community boundary of Collierville. There is only about 50 acres that could be developed within the community, the rest cannot be developed.
- Given the challenges facing agriculture in the Delta, there may be a need to create mechanisms that limit losing productive Delta islands.
- We need to grow business in the County. We have enough housing, we need jobs. How can we keep residents here, rather than have them commute to other areas?
- A land use designation request was submitted for property in the Banta area for industrial/commercial and rural residential/commercial. The Alternatives Report did not



include these development requests and they weren't included in the community preferences summary. These should be considered as part of the preferred alternative. Need to consider I-5/Kasson Road interchange for job-based development.

- Make sure to include I-205 and I-580 interchanges for consideration for job-based development. The County could use existing, available services in this area (e.g., Mountain House), but existing policies limit this.
- AL-5 zone between Lodi and Stockton should be considered. It's a good way to preserve farming and keep agriculture in the area viable.

PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING FARMINGTON:

- The General Plan should evaluate unincorporated communities and make sure they can grow and thrive. Farmington has many challenges. The water system is new, but relying on the existing 90 residents to pay is a challenge. Sewer service needs to be addressed. School population is dwindling and the school may not be sustainable in the long-term. There isn't housing to support people who work in agriculture. The community needs places for the next generation to live. Farmington needs some growth. Growth would allow the community to thrive. The General Plan can help ensure that smart growth occurs in unincorporated communities.
- Building new homes in Farmington will result in agricultural/urban conflicts. New homeowners will shut down nearby farming operations and impact local farmers. They will also impact wildlife and water resources. People who would move to new housing in Farmington would not be agricultural workers; they will be commuters.
- Residents weren't given enough notice of the Farmington expansion proposal. New development won't be compatible with agriculture. Farmington already has places for future generations to live. Farmington won't die without growth. If growth occurs, what will happen to water supplies? The community's water plant doesn't have capacity for much more development. How will fire and Sheriff services be provided? Adding growth to Farmington will continue trends of counties, including San Joaquin, losing agricultural lands to urban development.
- Farmington was set up to be a regional serving center for surrounding areas in the County. It has the services and connections. Central Farmington has seen single digit developments over the last 50 years. Some growth should be allowed to allow the community to thrive again.
- Volunteer fire services in Farmington would be greatly impacted. The fire district wasn't approached to consider development occurring in Farmington. In addition to Farmington, the district must also serve other areas within its larger service area. There are not enough volunteers and equipment to provide services to a lot of new growth and development.
- Farmington could use additional development to support the water company. Would save residents water costs. Farmington needs opportunities for businesses and residential growth to provide local jobs and services. There is a lot of through-traffic that could be capitalized on. In order to get Farmington back to its former glory, it needs growth. Should leave open the option to grow.