

Listening Session Meeting #4
Cosumnes Oaks High School
May 26, 2009
Key Notes

Floodplain Protection

- City can build in floodplain

Farmland & Agriculture

- Maintain agricultural land
- Consider economic impact to what City is taking away (i.e. farms, ranches)

Habitat & Open Space

- SOI would jeopardize the SSHCP
- SOI would expand urban footprint around the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge
- Need to maintain greenbelt between Galt and Elk Grove
- River-to River recreation corridor connection between Cosumnes and American River – *may cause conflict with farmland preservation*

Other

- SOI application was not citizen driven
- City should be focused to serve the current City residents and not focused on SOI
- City does not need to look outside with 8,000 undeveloped acres within City limits
- SOI would move the Urban Services Boundary (USB)
- Approval of SOI would trigger runaway real estate speculation
- SOI would discredit SACOG Blueprint
- There is no surface water supply to serve outside of the USB
- City/County need to have dialogues more open to the public - *also see scope of dialogue provided in ECOS letter to City dated May 22, 2009*
- USB won't be moved on east side of Hwy. 99
- Concern of resources spent on staff time for SOI
- Recommendation to put the SOI on voting ballot
- Landowners wanting to annex puts challenge on adjacent landowners
- Concern of SOI relationship with major electrical substation planned in southeast Elk Grove
- Approval of SOI would open door to uncertainty as City won't have power until annexation
- City needs to evaluate impacts to landowners between the SOI and annexation stage
- Economics of rapid growth created excess inventory to remain for 30-40 years, so no need to grow
- Smaller footprint is more beneficial than expanding
- Elected officials need to have answers or won't get re-elected
- Need to think about economic benefits of not developing – open space, recreation
- Need more discussion of how City will improve the quality of life
- People need to look at the historical facts in relation to City's General Plan and USB
- City is taking the right approach and should be allowed to move forward in planning the SOI area
- Landowners should have more voice
- City has been paved over and needs to focus on providing amenities (i.e. light rail, bike corridors)
- Development is the life force for City
- Push for SOI is developer driven since City/County and developers have relationship
- City does not have permanent planning staff so SOI work is a benefit to contract staff
- City will have blight as City boundaries moves out
- Obligations for current specific plans were already established by the County prior to Cityhood