

PUBLIC OUTREACH

**CITY OF MERCED
AREA 7 INDUSTRIAL PARK**

Prepared for:

City of Merced
Economic Development Department
678 W. 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340
Contact: Frank Quintero, Director

Consultant:



2816 Park Avenue
Merced, CA 95348
Contact: Desmond Johnston, AICP, Project Manager
Phone: (209) 723-2066

April 27, 2018

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| <i>SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION.....</i> | <i>2</i> |
| 1.1 - Purpose of the Study..... | 2 |
| 1.2 - Location of Plan Area..... | 2 |
| 1.3 - LAFCo Input..... | 3 |
| <i>SECTION 2 - Stakeholder Outreach.....</i> | <i>4</i> |
| 2.1 - Outreach Approach | 4 |
| 2.2 - Phone Interviews and Mailer Responses..... | 4 |
| <i>SECTION 3 - Neighborhood Outreach</i> | <i>7</i> |
| 3.1 - Advertising the Meeting | 7 |
| 3.2 - Outreach Meeting Summary | 7 |
| <i>SECTION 4 - Conclusion.....</i> | <i>8</i> |

Appendices

- A. Project Schedule**
- B. Letter to Property Owners**
- C. Narrative Summary of Interview Responses**
- D. List of Interview Questions**
- E. Neighborhood Outreach Meeting PowerPoint**
- F. Neighborhood Outreach Meeting Notes**
- G. Neighborhood Outreach Meeting Comment Cards**

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION


1.1 - Purpose of the Study

The City of Merced selected QK to provide professional planning services to conduct community outreach to the property owners and other interested stakeholders for the purpose of potentially annexing land for a future industrial park on the City's south side next to University Industrial Park and acceptance of a preferred site by the community. A report had been prepared by Chabin Concepts in May of 2017 to identify an area of the City that would be deemed most appropriate for needed industrial land; and, as a result of that study, the City Council selected the 1,267-acre Area 7 as the most suitable contiguous set of parcels for industrial development. QK was hired to move forward with the next step in the process – Community Outreach – by conducting interviews with stakeholders and presenting the background, benefits, and vision of the preferred site to the community. Planning services began on January 24, 2018 and ended with this summary report. Interviews were conducted primarily in mid-February and continued into April in order to reach as many property owners as possible, since some owners were away or live out-of-state. A neighborhood meeting was held on March 15. A timeline of planning activities is located in Appendix A of this document.

The City currently lacks a strong industrial base and the employment opportunities that it brings. The unemployment rate of Merced (9.2%) is much higher than the State's average of 4.2%. The median household income is 29% lower than the State's average. The City is anxious to find a site for industrial development since other industrial parks, Western and Airport Industrial Parks, are over 75% developed, and University Industrial Park has impediments to development. With an appropriate site, the City wants to attract a variety of industries including research and technology, warehousing and distribution, biotechnology, renewable energy, telecommunications, incubator businesses, ag-related industries, and more.

1.2 - Location of Plan Area

The parcels are in an area outside the city limits, but adjacent to the existing University Industrial Park located south of SR 140, west of Arboleda Drive, north of Mission Avenue, and east of Tower Road. The site has access to State Route 99, located 1.6-miles to the west, and is less than five miles to downtown Merced. In addition, the preferred site has access to rail.



Area 7 Location Map.

1.3 - LAFCo Input

In conjunction with any public outreach to the community, the City wanted to weigh the potential for annexation of the preferred parcels into the City with LAFCo. Scott McBride, City of Merced Community Development Director, met with LAFCo Executive Director, Bill Nicholson, on March 6, 2018 to explain City's objective, why Area 7 was chosen, and that this was a preliminary inquiry as to how the City should proceed. After discussion about the requirements of LAFCo, Mr. Nicholson focused on the process that he recommended.

1. The City should propose a General Plan/Specific Plan with text and plan amendments to more firmly define the purpose, infrastructure, buildout, etc, of the proposed site.
2. Include an environmental review for a Sphere of Influence (SOI) amendment. It would likely include agricultural land mitigation also based on recent actions and policies with Merced LAFCo.

In the end, Mr. Nicholson seemed receptive to the project as long as it followed all appropriate processes including necessary planning exercises that would be undertaken by the City.

SECTION 2 - STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

2.1 - Outreach Approach


The first step in the outreach process was to identify the list of property owners within Area 7 and their contact information. This list was compiled from County of Merced property tax records and reflected the ownership at the last property tax roll compilation done by the County of Merced. Common ownership among some of the parcels was identified and a new listing was run. QK initiated research through various databases and community to identify telephone numbers for property owners, as telephone numbers are not part of the property tax database. Telephone outreach to all the owners was initiated and included at least 3 attempts to reach them. Messages were left with several call-back options available. In addition, the City mailed letters to property owners notifying them of the City's potential interest in Area 7 for an industrial park. A copy of the letter is located in Appendix B of this document.

2.2 - Phone Interviews and Mailer Responses


QK prepared a list of six core survey questions that were reviewed and approved by the City. The stakeholder interviews were conducted initially from February 13 to 15 but continued through March and into April with several attempts, until 23 of the 26 property owners were reached by phone or in writing. The questions sought their thoughts for a vision for their property and the city; personal goals; concerns and issues; and, other ideas they might have.

The list of interview questions is in the Appendix C of this summary report. A final summation opportunity was provided to property owners that invited any additional thoughts or comments. Notes of these discussions are provided in Appendix D of this report.

The following graph depicts a visual summary of the opinions offered by the twenty-six property owners to the question, *"Would you support an effort to plan for industrial development of this area?"*



When viewed from the standpoint of representative acreage owned, the following graph depicts a summary of the same question, “*Would you support an effort to plan for the industrial development of this area?*”



Several caveats must be stated about the input collection process. While every attempt was made to cover all the items in the questionnaire with each property owner, interviews often didn’t proceed in a clearly ordered or planned fashion. Many property owners had questions that needed

to be addressed before they would express opinions, and others offered immediate and or extensive comments that addressed later questions on the survey. Still others offered some immediate responses; but, did not offer a specific response to other questions. Many desired to attend the public meeting to ask questions and respond in person.

The information from the interviews is presented in narrative fashion in the Appendix D of this document. It is not a verbatim transcription, but a summary that attempts to accurately capture the intent of each respondent. In a few instances respondents requested confidentiality be maintained by not including specific information provide that might identify them to readers of the report.

Many of the property owners had owned their land for more than a decade (10 to 35 years) and wanted to remain as farmers. They viewed farmland in this area as an asset. Some moved to this area to enjoy living in a rural setting. Others wanted to see economic growth, more jobs created, and stated that long-term change was inevitable, especially when considering a twenty- to thirty-year growth plan. They also felt that new development needed to be well-planned. Some viewed their property as a long-term investment and would be willing to accept a higher value for their farm land than current and future agricultural use would bring.

Profile of Survey Property Owner Roll – Industrial Area #7

- The area contains 47 separate parcels of property.
- The total acreage of the area is 1,267 acres.
- The parcels range in size from less than an acre to more than 165 acres.
- Uses are predominantly ag related, personal residences and some businesses.
- There are 26 owners of property within the area.
- Ten of the owners owned more than one parcel.
- Of the 26 owners in the area, 23 responded to the phone or written questions (88.5%)
- These 23 owners collectively own 1,173 acres of Area #7 (92.6%)

SECTION 3 - NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH

3.1 - Advertising the Meeting

The City placed advertisements in two local newspapers, the Merced Sun-Star and the Merced County Times, notifying the public of a public meeting on Area 7 facilitated by QK, to present the need for a new industrial park, the preferred location, background history of the community, and to gather their input, ideas, and concerns for a future industrial park in their neighborhood.

3.2 - Outreach Meeting Summary

The meeting was held at the Pioneer Elementary School on a weekday evening for maximum participation by local residents. Pioneer is located 1.5 miles from Area 7. Facilitated by QK, other co-facilitators were the City Economic Director and the Community Development Director. Nearly two dozen local residents and stakeholders participated in the public meeting, including the Weaver School District superintendent and several board members. QK prepared a PowerPoint presentation (Appendix E) and sought questions and input from the community. Presenters emphasized that this would be a long-term effort of five to 20 years to become ready for industrial development, and that anyone who wishes to farm can continue farming. Following is a condensed summary of the comments received at the Neighborhood Outreach Meeting. A complete set of notes can be found in Appendix F.

- Residents expressed concern for the truck traffic that would result from the proposed development. The increased amount of traffic on both Childs Avenue and Campus Parkway were identified. There was concern for the safety of school children when truck traffic is added the roadways.
- Some wanted to see improvement to Childs Avenue as part of an overall plan.
- A site closer to the SR 99 was suggested. Others suggested that the City consider a site or sites west of SR 99.
- Concern for converting prime farmland to industrial use was expressed.
- The Weaver Union School District wanted to be included in any progress moving forward on the Area 7 industrial park.



The advertisement that appeared in the local newspapers.

- Some suggested that the City consider the site owned by Wal-Mart for an industrial park.
- Some suggested that the local dairies be converted to industrial use before prime farmland.
- Some are in favor of “new development in the area”.

Comment Cards

Neighborhood Outreach meeting attendees were invited to offer comments and questions at the meeting, and to fill out comment cards and insert them in a drop box additionally or if preferred. Four comment cards were completed, and the comments have been transcribed and attached to this report as Appendix G. Three of the comments expressed displeasure with the concept of industrial uses being established in the area, and one of the comments is supportive.

SECTION 4 - CONCLUSION

As shown in the graphs on Page 4 of this report, a majority of property owners indicate a favorable response to the Area 7 expansion of the University Industrial Park – 42.3% in favor versus 34.6% opposed. Further, in terms of land area owned, owners representing 60.1% of Area 7 favor a transition to industrial land use. Those in support of the industrial park did so for several reasons. While many enjoy farming as an interim use, their long-term goals were to find the highest economic use and value for their property knowing the industrial park is a long-term project. Others were in support of Merced’s need for additional employment and a strong industrial base.

Other attendees at the neighborhood outreach meeting, however, expressed varying levels of apprehension relating primarily to the loss of prime farmland, truck traffic, increased traffic overall, and a diminished pastoral setting.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
PROJECT SCHEDULE


Merced “Area 7” Industrial Park Outreach Schedule

| Task | Scope of Work Task | Date |
|----------|--|------------------|
| 1 | Kick Off Meeting | Jan 24 |
| 2 | Conduct Interviews | |
| | 2a - City to provide QK with updated list of property owners | Jan 31 |
| | 2b - City staff to return draft List of Interview Questions w/comments to QK | Feb 7 |
| | 2c – QK and City to research to each gather phone #s for the list, and trade | Feb 7 |
| | 2d – City will mail out letter to property owners | Feb 8 |
| | 2e – QK makes interview calls to property owners | Feb 13-15 |
| 3 | Neighborhood Meeting | |
| | 3a – QK will prepare a flyer for newspaper and direct mailing | Feb 15 |
| | 3b – City will place newspaper ad twice (15 and 5 days in advance of Meeting) | Feb 27 & March 9 |
| | 3c – City will mail flyer to property owners and stakeholders | March 5 |
| | 3d – QK will provide draft PowerPt to staff for review | March 7 |
| | 3e – Presentation by QK to Neighborhood and stakeholders (Pioneer or Weaver school) | March 15 |
| 4 | LAFCo Staff interview – City staff and QK will meet w/LAFCo director and summarize discussion | March 6 |
| 5 | Report Completion – QK will provide outreach summary to City staff | April 30 |
| | City staff to take Report to CC as information item | May 7 |

Updated 4/26/2018

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PROPERTY OWNERS



Office of Economic Development (800) 723-4788 (209) 385-6827 Office (209) 723-1780 Fax

February 9, 2018

Re: Interview Regarding Industrial Park Study Area #7

Dear Property Owner:

The Merced City Council evaluated areas surrounding the City for future long-term growth of the community's industrial property base. Of the five areas recently studied, the City Council decided on an eastward expansion of University Industrial Park for further outreach and review as Merced's next long-term industrial growth region. The Industrial Park Study Area is bordered by Highway 140 to the north, Tower Road to the west, Arboleta Drive to the east, and Mission Avenue to the south.

As a property owner in this area, the City of Merced desires to collect input from you about these conceptual plans.

The long-term growth plans would direct future business growth towards the area identified on the attached map. The change in the area would be gradual (over many years), and requires extensive planning and public improvements before any changes could happen in the area. This long term planning effort would not require any changes to your individual property's current use.


The City of Merced contracted with QK, Inc., a professional planning and engineering firm with offices in Merced, to secure input from you about the future planning for your area. QK staff will be calling you in the near future, and would like speak with you for about 10 minutes about these ideas. Should you prefer to contact QK directly, please call John Quiring (209/723-2066) with your thoughts or questions. The City will also host an open house at a later date where you will have the opportunity to meet personally and discuss these plans.

Thank you for your assistance, and cooperation in advance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading 'Frank Quintero'.

Frank Quintero, Director of Economic Development
City of Merced, (209) 385-6826



| PARCEL | OWNER | ACRES |
|-------------|--|--------|
| 061-290-010 | HAFLICH SHERYL I & ROBERT W | 5.66 |
| 061-290-029 | ENGLERT JOHN H & EDNA L TRUSTEES | 4.92 |
| 061-290-030 | CARTER GREG A & GLORIA A | 5.29 |
| 061-290-012 | MACHADO JOSEPH A & LAURA C TRUSTEE | 54.20 |
| 061-290-025 | SLATER NANCY PELLISSIER | 16.47 |
| 061-290-007 | CAMPOS FRANCES N TRUSTEE | 38.50 |
| 061-290-006 | MONTGOMERY LANG H | 22.86 |
| 061-290-008 | SLATER NANCY PELLISSIER TRUSTEE | 19.21 |
| 061-290-048 | SLATER NANCY PELLISSIER TRUSTEE | 62.91 |
| 061-290-049 | MONTGOMERY FARMS LP | 32.36 |
| 061-290-024 | SANCHEZ MANUEL V & MARY L | 30.87 |
| 061-290-050 | ALLEN PEGGY G & BRYAN A | 1.11 |
| 061-290-004 | CARDWELL RANCHES LP | 35.00 |
| 061-290-043 | VANWYHE JD & KATHY TRUSTEE | 18.30 |
| 061-290-044 | VANWYHE JD & KATHY TRUSTEE | 19.55 |
| 061-290-051 | ALLEN GEORGE T SR & LINDA M TRUSTEES | 19.61 |
| 061-290-045 | VANWYHE JD & KATHY TRUSTEE | 19.42 |
| 061-290-036 | ALLEN GEORGE T SR & LINDA M TRUSTEES | 35.89 |
| 061-290-037 | LEE DANIEL & LINDA Y | 35.87 |
| 061-290-054 | SANCHEZ YLDEFONSO V & MARY C TRUSTEES | 19.75 |
| 061-290-033 | HANSEN RONALD W & KATHRYN E TRUSTEES | 20.82 |
| 061-290-039 | HANSEN RONALD W & KATHRYN E TRUSTEES | 20.16 |
| 061-290-040 | HANSEN RONALD W & KATHRYN E TRUSTEES | 20.12 |
| 061-290-031 | FARNSWORTH JOHN T TRUSTEE | 19.09 |
| 061-290-032 | FARNSWORTH JOHN T TRUSTEE | 18.34 |
| 061-290-014 | EARLEY DONNA J TRUSTEE | 21.23 |
| 061-290-015 | MARTINELLI LEONARD & LINDA M TRUSTEES | 20.92 |
| 061-290-016 | VIANI LARRY J | 19.57 |
| 061-290-019 | VIANI LARRY J | 76.46 |
| 061-033-017 | PORTER NEIL W TRUSTEE | 16.74 |
| 061-033-012 | BARNELL THOMAS R & SARAH A TRUSTEES | 19.65 |
| 061-033-015 | KANG JAGTAR & KANG PREETPAL S | 17.14 |
| 061-033-014 | KANG JAGTAR & KANG PREETPAL S | 19.58 |
| 061-033-013 | MCCABE HEBERT LESLIE JR & ELIZABETH D TRUSTEES | 15.74 |
| 061-033-009 | ROCHA JOHN C & ANGELINA D TRUSTEES | 56.44 |
| 061-033-008 | CROP PRODUCTION SERVICES INC | 9.42 |
| 061-033-007 | VOJE INC | 21.58 |
| 061-033-016 | PEGUERO ALFRED & CLIPPER DEBORAH TRUSTEE | 55.19 |
| 061-033-011 | KLEIBER MICHAEL C & MOLLY DIANNA | 55.62 |
| 061-033-010 | ROCHA JOHN C & ANGELINA D TRUSTEES | 51.90 |
| 061-033-006 | VOJE INC | 6.70 |
| 061-033-005 | VOJE INC | 0.92 |
| 061-290-021 | SLATER NANCY PELLISSIER TRUSTEE | 165.35 |
| 061-290-026 | VILLANUEVA FERNANDO & VEGA-PERAL MARTHA ALICIA | 0.86 |
| 061-290-038 | No Data | 19.32 |

City of Merced Industrial Park Study Area #7

APPENDIX C

NARRATIVE SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Merced Industrial Project – Property Owners Response Summaries

Owners Interview Collection Process Description:

A list of all property owners was identified within the 1267-acre area described as Industrial Park Study Area #7. This list was compiled from County of Merced property tax records and reflected the ownership at the last property tax roll compilation done by the County. Common ownership among some of the parcels was identified and a new listing was run. QK initiated research through various databases and community to identify telephone numbers for property owners, as telephone numbers are not part of the property tax database. Potential telephone numbers were identified for ___ out of ___ owners. Telephone outreach to all the owners was initiated and at least 3 attempts to reach them and leave messages was attempted with several call back options provided to the owner. In addition, ___ mailings were sent to each property owner of record.

A list of six core questions was developed with two additional questions for property owners who invited additional discussion. A final summation opportunity was included that invited any additional thoughts or comments.

Several caveats must be stated about the input collection process. While every attempt was made to cover all the items in the questionnaire with each property owner, interviews often don't proceed in a clearly ordered or planned fashion. Many property owners had questions that needed to be addressed before they would express opinions and others offered immediate and or extensive comments that immediately addressed later questions. Still others offered some immediate response but did not offer a specific response to one or more questions, as they desired to attend the public meeting to ask questions in person. All these responses are equally valid and useful to the goal which is to initiate and collect input from our targeted property owners.

The information from the interviews is presented in narrative fashion. It is not a verbatim transcription, but a summary that attempts to accurately capture the intent of each respondent. In a few instances respondent requested confidentiality be maintained by not including specific information provide that might identify them to readers of the report.

Profile of Survey Property Owner Roll – Industrial Area #7

- The area contains 47 separate parcels of property.
- The total acreage of the area is 1267 acres.
- The parcels range in size from less than an acre to more than 165 acres.
- Uses are predominantly ag related, personal residences and some businesses.
- There are 26 owners of property within the area.
- Ten of the owners owned more than one parcel.
- Of the 26 owners in the area, 23 responded to the phone or written questions (88.5%)
- These 23 owners collectively own 1173 acres of Area #7 (92.6%)

| | YES | NO | AMBIVALENT or UNSURE | No Answer |
|---|-------|-------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Responses of 26 Property Owners - # | 11 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| Responses of 26 Property Owners - % | 42.3% | 34.6% | 11.5% | 11.5% |
| Responses of Property Owners by Acreage - # | 761 | 342 | 70 | 94 |
| Responses of Property Owners by Acreage - % | 60.1% | 27.0% | 5.5% | 7.4% |

Telephone Interview Responses

Response #1

PO had owned the property for more than 40 years and currently farmed various tree crops. He described himself as “older” who intended for the property to benefit his children.

PO described his goals as a businessman who valued his property as very good land but was open to changing it’s use to a higher value if it would benefit his family and be good for the community. PO expressed support for plans for potential change as long as it was well planned and the best place for future growth. PO felt that 20 years from now the community needed more job areas.

PO did not have any concerns at this time about special needs of the area or future changes. He added that his children and grandchildren needed more opportunities in the future and he would send a family member to the meeting.

Response #2

PO has owned the property for a few years, lives on-site and operates a small farm operation. PO described a very contentious experience in another community with a State agency which involved an eminent domain action. PO and I had an extensive discussion that addressed this concern.

PO stated that their goal for the property was to leave it as ag-based use and envisioned no change. They planned to operate their small farming operation indefinitely. PO stated they would not support any change to more urbanized use of any form. PO’s long-term concern for the area was encroaching urbanization and asked that their comments clearly underscored their desire to see the area remain rural in nature.

Response #3

PO and family has owned property within and around the area since the late 1960’s. PO stated that their goals were to continue to farm the property unless other opportunities presented through growth of the Merced area. In the meantime, they would continue with current use.

PO stated that they were very supportive of any plans to expand availability of sites for appropriate light industrial and business growth. He stated that he had no specific concerns but just wanted it planned well through responsible experts in planning for job center growth. PO had no further views on the area but asked to continue to be kept abreast of interest or plans for the area.

Response #4

PO stated that they have owned property in the area for several years and were committed to long-term farming. Their long-term goals were to continue farming and considered this an excellent area in which to pursue ag-related activity.

PO expressed that his only concern for the area involved encroachment of more urbanized uses into this area. He stated that he would not sell or develop his property for any other use. PO felt that ag use was the best opportunity for the area.

Response #5

PO stated that he has farmed and owns land both within the identified area as well as in areas outside of Area #7. He and his family have been in the area for over 35 years. He stated he also has other business interests unrelated to agriculture. His long-term goals are to manage his property for their best economic use.

PO stated that he would support any good plan for light industrial growth in the area and considers it a critical need for Merced's future. He stated that he believes there are many opportunities that have missed Merced as the community was unprepared and the City needed to invest in infrastructure to better plan for its' future. PO also stated that better coordination with the County needed to occur to prevent spotty commercial and industrial growth. PO stated that the proposed concept of a new job center was consistent with his vision for the area.

Response #6

PO stated that they had lived in the area for about 30 years and has a small ag use on their property also. Their long-term goals were to stay on the property in the current use. They also stated that they were uncertain of their thoughts on any proposed changes as they had not fully discussed the prospect of change in their area.

PO also stated that they felt change would inevitably happen in Merced as the City grew but they were not yet prepared to speak specifically to it as it relates to this area. They did believe that any future growth needs to be very well planned and have the support of the community. They did not have any further concerns but planned to attend any community meetings.

Response #7

PO stated that their enterprise had been in the area for over 35 years and its' current use was ag related. They had no long-term goals beyond the continued operation of their operation at this site. The PO stated that he didn't have a strong opinion either way about the development of the area. If their site ended up with a higher economic value than their current operation they would probably move to another nearby location.

PO indicated they perceived that long-term change in the area was inevitable. If the community envisioned a better or different direction they would accept that vision. Their only long-term concern would be to ensure that road infrastructure was well planned to support and accommodate planned development.

Response #8

PO stated that they had owned their property in the area between 15-20 years and currently had an ag use. They further stated that although they support ag, their long-term goal for the property was to get the highest use as an investment and hoped for some type of enhanced development for the area.

PO stated that they supported further consideration of the proposed industrial development concept for the area. They stated that they wanted it well planned, and supportive of the type of jobs that would be good for the Merced area. Their primary concern was the development of the correct infrastructure to support the long-term development and that this plan was consistent with their vision for the area.

Response #9

PO stated that their family had farmed in the area for three generations and continued to farm tree crops. The PO spoke highly of the property they farmed for its ag operations and quality of the soil. PO goals for their property would be to continue to farm in the long term as they were currently doing.

PO stated that their vision for the area was for it to continue as ag related. They stated they did not support development of the area outside of the City limits and that enough development of industrial and commercial uses had already occurred.

Response #10

PO stated that their family has farmed the area for about 30 years with tree crops. They also stated that their probable goals were to continue to farm but were not completely closed to considering other uses. They were not sure if they would support changes to the area but would need to discuss further among their family and partners before expressing a strong opinion about possible change.

The PO stated that while they are basically farmers, they support good growth for the City and realize the UC will add to some of the good growth for the area. They expressed some concerns about preserving property rights for owners as an important part of any future plans for the areas and making sure current property owners were not threatened with eminent domain issues like the HSR problems.

Response #11

PO stated that he had owned the property for about 10 years and farmed it currently in tree crops. He further stated that his long-term goal was to get the best investment return on the property as either ag or other use. PO further stated that he supports well planned growth and that if it led to better and more jobs he supported transitioning to other uses of the land he owned.

Response #12

PO stated that they had been farming between 15-20 years at this property with tree crops and the property had a small number of owners in its history. The PO stated their present use was planned to be continued and their goal was to do so into the long-term.

The PO owner stated they probably would not support long-term development plans for the area as they were concerned it would eventually impact their use of their own property. They valued the quality of the farmland and believe it to be an asset to the area. The PO thought the UC was a good enhancement to Merced and would cause some growth but hoped it would be in a different area. They did believe the labor pool needed more training for the good of the area.

Response #13

PO stated that they currently farmed the property and had for over 20 years. They stated that their long-term goal was to farm unless they could get better economic value for their property. They stated that they supported the expansion of the growth to this area as long as it was well planned and took advantage of the benefits of the UC.

The PO wanted to see the Campus parkway extended faster and to develop the infrastructure to support jobs in the area. He stated that Merced has all the advantages for positive growth of the economy and the City and County needed to build on that. He stated he believed this plan was consistent with his vision for the area.

Response #14

PO has owned the property for more than 10 years and the property is zoned for ag without any crops currently. PO plans to put crop in as an interim use but long-term goals are to find it's highest economic use in the next 10-20 years. PO stated he supported new plan for the area as long as it was well planned and supported good job growth. PO stated that the planning process should be very transparent to all the property owners if anything was pursued further for this Area #7. PO stated he would be interested in further information and hoped to attend the meeting.

Response #15

PO stated that they have resided at their site for more than 30 years and had no long-term plans to change. PO stated that the reason they moved to this area was for the rural nature of the area and did not support any further urbanization. PO wanted the land to remain agricultural and believed that further industrial development would generally be a negative factor in their quality of life. The PO expressed some concerns with flooding but did not provide any further specifics. They stated this plan was not consistent with their vision for the future of the area.

The PO contacted the consultant after the public meeting and asked for this specific statement to be made part of their response, and also submitted similar written responses to the questionnaire: *"We were at the meeting at Pioneer Elementary School Thursday, March 15. We would like to have our farm land preserved for agriculture and not industrial purposes. We would prefer to see any growth done on the West side Hwy. 99. More and more of Merced County's prime Ag land is being destroyed."*

Response #16

PO stated that they or their family had owned or farmed their property for many decades. They stated that while they loved farming, they supported change for the area and did not have a long-term goal to continue farming their property. Their vision for the area was to see it transition into an area that would support job creation in the community.

They further stated they wanted the City to be more aggressive, to not chase of business opportunities, to make sure non-contributors to economic growth were not attracted to the area and to help create better jobs.

Response #17

PO stated that they had been farming tree crops for a number of decades both inside the Area #7 and outside of the area. PO stated that their short-medium term goals are to continue farming and long term would be driven by economic conditions and opportunities. PO stated he was not against future growth of high quality economic development but needed to be well planned and support Merced's needs for employment. Also tied to the UC. He had no other specific concerns. PO stated that if area transitioned to business/industrial, the City would need to have strong standards for aesthetics and infrastructure and enforce them. PO could not attend public meeting but wanted to be actively involved if possible.

Response #18

PO stated that they had been farming for many years but declined to specify how long. They stated that they enjoyed farming and would continue to do so as long as it was practical. They preferred ag use for the area but would support industrial or commercial use for the area if they obtained better value for their property. They strongly stated that they hoped and would only support quality planning and hoped the UC would be a big part of the area's future. The PO did not have any specific ideas for what could be done for the area but just wanted good growth for Merced.

Response #19

PO stated that they owned the land for investment for a number of years and ag use was best use at this point. They stated they did not have a strong feeling about the eventual use of the property but would support more urban development as long as it was well done. They stated they wanted whatever development occurred to support the property values in the area and make sure it was done well. The PO declined to discuss their property or views any further.

Written Questionnaire Responses:

Four property owners were not reached by telephone but submitted written responses to the interview questions following their attendance at the public meeting.

Response #1

PO purchased several pieces of land to farm that they have owned since 1992. Both have pistachios orchards. PO stated their goal is to farm for the next 30 years. They believe this is farm land that should be left as it is and that there is a lot of un-developed industrial land already in this area. PO did not want someone building something next door that is industrial that prevents them from farming – spraying, harvesting, etc.

Response #2

PO stated they have lived and farmed over 50 years and their long-term goals are to have the property stay in family and farm. They do not support further development in this area and would prefer the property stay as it is as farmland. PO stated they do not believe the conditions will change enough to

support industrial development and it will only attract less desirable development. They would like the City to stop further consideration and focus only on other City issues such as crime, homelessness, fixing existing infrastructure and better retail and entertainment development. The PO cited Turlock as an example for further development.

Response #3

PO stated they have lived and farmed for 15 years, primarily almonds, Because of the location and its prime farm ground. Their long-term goal is to continue living here and growing almonds for profit and did not support a change in the area. They stated they would support it staying very similar to the way it looks now, but with the pot holes fixed. They felt this was a high value agricultural area that needs to be protected. They encouraged the City to find another area that isn't a high value farm land area and to clean up and reuse other areas first.

Response #4

The PO stated their family originally purchased in 1950's and has been passed down in the family and have farmed a pistachio orchard. Long-term they plan for retirement on the site and do not support expansion beyond Tower road. They stated this area looks good now and as existing agriculture they believe it needs to stay that way. They mentioned the soil is very good. They stated they do not support change in the area and Merced needs more improvement elsewhere.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Merced “Area 7” Property Owner Interview Questions

1. Do you live in and/or farm the parcel? Why did you acquire this land, how long have you owned it, and what is its present use?
2. What are your goals for this property? Are they short- to mid-term (5-10 years) or long term (10 – 20 years)?
3. Would you support an effort to plan for the industrial development of this area?
4. If you looked 20 years into the future, what would you like this area east of Merced to look like?
5. Is there one concern or issue that needs special attention?
6. What would you change, enhance, or add to this area if it is zoned industrial? What results would you hope to see from that change?

APPENDIX E

NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH MEETING POWERPOINT

City of Merced

Industrial Park Study Area 7

Neighborhood Outreach Meeting



Thursday, March 15, 2018

6:00-7:00pm

Pioneer Elementary School



Introductions

Frank Quintero: City of Merced

John Quiring: QK Public Outreach

Desmond Johnston, AICP: QK Project Manager



Background

Unemployment Rates*:

City of Merced: 9.2%

State of California: 4.2%



* As of December 2017; US Labor Department,
Bureau of Labor Statistics.



Background

Median Household Income*:

City of Merced: \$41,312**

State of California: \$67,739

**Note: 29% lower than State average.



* City-data.com.



Background

The City lacks a strong industrial base and the employment opportunities it brings.



Background

- City commissioned a study by DSG Advisors*/Chabin Concepts, Inc. in 2017.
- Looked at Merced “as seen over nearly 30 years viewed from the perspective of different industries, technologies, and Merced’s unique development forces.”
- The group looked at five sites in Merced County and narrowed the selection to two, and recommended Site #7.
- Today, we seek public input on preferred Site #7.



* An international corporate site selection firm.




The City wants to attract:

- Ag-related Industries.
- Research and Technology.
- Warehousing and Distribution.
 - Biotechnology.
 - Telecommunications.
 - Renewable Energy.
- Start Up and Incubator Businesses.
 - More




General Plan Map




Existing Industrial Parks

- Western and Airport Industrial Parks are over 75% developed.
- The University Industrial Park has impediments to development, i.e., power lines, existing ownership.



Aerial of Site #7



Why Site #7?

- 1,267-acres
- Next to University Industrial Park (expansion potential).
- City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) and General Plan consistency.
- Highway access and access to future Merced Loop.
- Rail service including double-tracking.



Why Site #7?

- Available utility infrastructure.
- Police and Fire availability.
- Absence of existing land uses now and in the future.
- Curb appeal of large and multi-national corporations.
- No dairies.



Public Outreach

1. Interviews with property owners.
2. Today's Neighborhood Meeting
3. Report findings of interviews and outreach meeting to City, and City will decide on next steps.



Sample Interview Questions

- Do you live in and/or farm the parcel? Why did you acquire this land, how long have you owned it, and what is its present use?
- What are your goals for this property? Are they short- to mid-term (5-10 years) or long term (10 – 20 years)?
- Would you support an effort to plan for the industrial development of this area?
- If you looked 20 years into the future, what would you like this area east of Merced to look like?
- Is there one concern or issue that needs special attention?



Comments or Questions?



Thank You...

for attending the
Neighborhood Outreach Meeting



APPENDIX F

NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH MEETING NOTES

AREA 7 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTES

3/15/2018 6PM

- Are we still looking at the other site?
- Could this be developed before the site that Walmart didn't use?
Frank Q response—S. Perry Road in Patterson- took 30 years.
- What route will those trucks take exactly?
The Klein family has worked to see a mall out here
All these trucks will interfere with the school
- The city said there were several dairies on the other side, but there was only one
- Would rather we clean up some problem land – where dairies were – before using up/cover up good farmland
- Is this powerpoint available?
- What is the timeline going forward?
- About 20 years ago, when they did the Pluim Plan, the city council said that Industrial should not come past Tower Road, to preserve the prime ag land.
- The trucks- I live about 2 blocks away- now the retail thing popped us. We have a lot of traffic. Would like to know what the Pluims think about the trucks going through their retail project.
- Would improvements to Childs Avenue be part of the plan?
Frank Q response —during the study, we would identify the kind of road it will be.
- If all of those trucks are going to the freeway, why don't you put this by the freeway?
- Why do you want our land, prime land, when you can do this elsewhere?
- Why can't Merced..... but they're eating prime ag land
- This was all protected ag land when we bought here
- Wasn't the Walmart site on the University Industrial Park?
- The city usually already knows what it wants.
- Superintendent Curry—we have a strong interest, 2,800 students, 1,200 families—we really want to be part of the progress

AREA 7 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTES

3/15/2018 6PM

- That new store going across the street from the high school---do we have a voice when these things happened? I didn't hear about it.
- The Walmart site--- Frank Q response - Walmart still owns it.
- Parking by McLane trucks is insane, city should build them a parking lot.
- Whether this takes 5 or 25 years—it's either good or bad now and then.
- This is the best Ag land
- What would it take to remove this "Area" from the study and look at the other areas?
- If we're a property owner, will we be notified of any community meeting on this?
- We have a nice home on 20 acres.

APPENDIX G

NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH MEETING COMMENT CARDS

AREA 7 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING COMMENT CARDS

3/15/2018 6PM

| | |
|---|---|
| No Name | There are too many issues with this town that needs to be addressed than this mess. Pioneer School no parking this is prime farm land. This should always stay that way. |
| Renee Nelson Trustee member Weaver Union School 50 Luke Ct Merced | I am very concerned as a homeowner that you would choose prime agricultural land for a project like this. I am personally against this. I believe you should pick areas much close to the freeway for traffic. As a board member I am concerned about traffic in our area especially on Campus Parkway and Childs Ave. We are trying to attract people to our city and new UC and an Industrial Park is not the best invitation at the Campus Parkway area. I do believe the city needs new jobs but we need to look in other areas that might be better suited and not use prime land. We also need to keep our students safe with less truck traffic. |
| Jenae Day jday@weaverusd.org mrsday@jdaze.com | I am a teacher at Pioneer. I own 4.9 acres on the east part of Vassar east of Highway 99, so I don't believe my property is affected but I'm close to the development area. My husband and I are actually excited about finally seeing some development in Merced, but we also feel for property owners that are affected. From what I listened to at this meeting, property owners were told that imminent domain is not a factor, so owners would have a choice (which is different then what my husband and I went through with the high speed rail at that time) We are very excited about the project and hope that it can gain more support as the time goes. I would like to know about meetings to come.**send notices to contact info** |
| Karen Wallace Weaver School District Trustee | I am not in favor and recommend and urge looking at other sites. A couple of compelling reasons: 1. This is PRIME FARMLAND!! 2. Additional truck traffic on Childs Ave/Campus Parkway. Additional traffic will be arriving with the new retail center. We DO NOT need additional trucks and/or industrial park traffic. |